DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 720 TM 810 628

AUTHOR Baker, Jerry R.: And Others
TITLE Meta Evaluation of the Saginaw Township Middle School Enrichment Center Project, 1979-80.
SPONS AGENCY Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.: Saginaw Township Community Schools, Mich.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Enrichment Activities: *Evaluation Criteria: Evaluation Methods: Gifted: Intermediate Grades: Junior High Schools: *Program Evaluation: *Standards
IDENTIFIERS Evaluation Standards: *Meta Evaluation

ABSTRACT

In 1979, the Saginaw (MI) Township Community Schools contracted with the Evaluation Research Center of the University of Virginia to evaluate its Middle School Enrichment Center for gifted and talented students in grades 5-8. This meta evaluation assesses the extent to which that evaluation was technically adequate in revealing the merit of the Enrichment Center: useful in guiding decisions: ethical in dealing with people and organizations: and practical in using resources. Data for the meta evaluation were collected through interviews with the primary evaluation staff, interviews with the Enrichment Center staff, and a review of the primary evaluation final report. The evaluation will be reviewed in terms of the standards for technical adequacy, usefulness, ethics, and practicality: and in terms of the objective analysis sheets included in the program proposal. (Author/BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206720

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

META EVALUATION
OF THE
SAGINAW TOWNSHIP MIDDLE SCHOOL
ENRICHMENT CENTER PROJECT

1979-80

Funded by a grant from the Michigan Department of Education
and the Saginaw Township Community Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. N. Claus
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 810628

This study was conducted by:

Dr. Jerry R. Baker
Richard N. Claus
Michael Manley

August, 1980

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	2
Procedures for Meta Evaluation	6
Comparison of Proposed Versus Actual Services	10
Presentation and Analysis of Data	21
Summary of Findings	34
Conclusion	37
Recommendations	38
Appendix A	40
Appendix B	59

I. Introduction

This meta evaluation of the Saginaw Township Middle School Enrichment Center was undertaken during the summer of 1980 at the request of the Michigan Department of Education and the Saginaw Township Community Schools.

The study was conducted independently by three evaluators with over thirty years of combined experience in program evaluation. The findings presented in this meta evaluation are based on a thorough study of the primary evaluation and represent the professional judgement of the meta evaluators.

As with any evaluation effort -- whether primary or meta -- the information and findings presented in the following pages are designed to help improve future efforts. As always, the emphasis is on encouraging the highest caliber of work.

II. Background

In April, 1979, the Saginaw Township Community Schools sent out a Request For Proposal (RFP) to a number of evaluation agencies, both in-state and out-of-state. The district was seeking a unit capable of conducting an extensive evaluation of its Middle School Enrichment Center for gifted and talented students in grades five through eight. The project is funded under ESEA, Title IV, Part C: Education Innovation and Support.

One of the institutions contacted was the School of Education, University of Virginia. Saginaw Township's request was sent specifically to Dr. Carolyn Callahan, associate professor, Department of Foundations. Dr. Callahan was known by the project staff through her work as a consultant with the Saginaw Intermediate School District, where she had conducted workshops on the evaluation of gifted and talented programs. Dr. Callahan and Dr. Robert Covert, associate professor in the Evaluation Research Center at the University of Virginia, wrote a proposal for evaluation of the project and submitted it to Saginaw Township officials in June of 1979.

After reviewing the proposals of a number of interested evaluation agencies, the Township decided to subcontract the design and development of the project's evaluation components through the Evaluation Research Center of the University of Virginia.

The terms of the contract called for the following:

- development of an overall evaluation design for both the academic component of the program and for the emerging fine and performing arts component
- development of instruments to measure critical thinking skills and self-perception
- development of evaluation tools to measure the content units taught in the program for academically talented and the program in fine and performing arts
- development of a Manual for Evaluation and a Curriculum Guide outlining suggested evaluation processes and procedures in the former and instructional units (goals, objectives and activities) in the latter.

While the evaluation components were to be completed over the three-year period of the grant, the initial contract with the University of Virginia was for the summer of 1979 only, during which time the evaluation team was to develop the pilot form of the critical thinking instrument. The understanding was that if the evaluation team delivered an acceptable product to the Township by fall, a continuing contract would be awarded.

Why contract with the University of Virginia's Evaluation Research Center when there were a number of reputable evaluation agencies in the state of Michigan that offered their services? As Dr. Michael Caldwell, director of the Center, explained: "We were better able to marry the two notions of evaluation and gifted education. We had expertise in both areas. That is one of our strengths." Also, as he noted, "we were more willing to get our hands dirty" in the day-to-day work of helping to develop a curriculum and to conduct a detailed evaluation. Saginaw Township officials expressed similar reasons for their selection, in essence trading off the distance in miles between the two institutions for the expertise of the University of Virginia staff.

Before detailing the chronology of the evaluation efforts conducted by the University of Virginia staff during 1979-80, it might be helpful to examine the organization of the Evaluation Research Center, the professional staff involved in the project and how it was organized to conduct the Enrichment Center evaluation.

Evaluation Research Center Organization. The principal participants in the Enrichment Center evaluation project were:

- Dr. Michael Caldwell, director of the Evaluation Research Center and also director of the School of Education's Research and Evaluation Department.
- Dr. Carolyn Callahan; associate professor, Department of Foundations, School of Education
- Dr. Robert Covert, associate professor, Evaluation Research Center
- Martin Aylesworth, graduate assistant, Research and Evaluation Department
- Peggy Vanco, graduate assistant, Research and Evaluation Department
- Mary Crovo, graduate assistant, Research and Evaluation Department.

The individuals listed above have a unique blend of experiences in both evaluation and gifted and talented education (see vitas in Appendix A for a complete listing of their individual credentials). In addition to Drs. Callahan and Covert. Dr. Callhan areas, the two graduate students -- Marty Aylesworth and Peggy Vanco -- who spent the most time on the project both have extensive academic training and teaching experience in the area of gifted and talented.

For this particular project, the individuals involved carried out a number of roles. Dr. Caldwell was responsible for negotiating the contract with Saginaw Township and with administering the overall budget, but was not involved in the day-to-day direction of the project. That job fell to Dr. Callahan and Covert. Dr. Callahan supervised the daily work of the graduate students, served as a liaison with the Saginaw Township staff, and provided expertise in gifted and talented for both staffs. Dr. Covert, by design, remained removed from the day-to-day work of the others, serving as a "sounding board" for their work at weekly staff meetings. With his extertise in evaluation, his role was primarily one of critiquing his colleagues' work with an eye toward improving the final product. He remained, in the words of one participant, the "objective check" on the entire process. The daily work on curriculum development, test development and the fine arts component was carried out by the three graduate students. Marty Aylesworth spent the summer of 1979 working on the pilot of the critical thinking instrument. Beginning in the fall, he divided his time 50-50 between instrument development and the academic component. Peggy Vanco, who began in September, divided her time evenly between the critical thinking instrument and the fine arts component. Mary Crovo worked full-time from June of 1979 through May of 1980 on the critical thinking instrument.

The graduate students devoted all their time -- usually far more than the 88 contract hours per month -- to the Enrichment Center project. Dr. Callahan averaged approximately one day per week on the project, while Dr. Covert averaged approximately one-half day per week.

According to the participants, the internal organization of the evaluation team was arranged in such a way as to assure that their work would be as objective

as possible. Weekly staff meetings were designed to review progress, discuss problems, and present and critique work to date. From interviews, all participants, the impression emerged that no one on this project worked in a vacuum.

Chronology of Evaluation. During 1979-80, the evaluation efforts of the Evaluation Research Center staff proceeded in a number of areas: critical thinking instrument development (both pilot and final versions); academic curriculum design and development; affective (self-perception) instrument development; and fine arts curriculum development.

• SEA Test: However, the major focus of evaluation during the first year was the development of the critical thinking instrument, which became known as the SEA test. The SEA test (an acronym for synthesis, evaluation, and analysis), as the final evaluation report noted, "was developed as an instrument to assess the growth in critical thinking skills among students in programs for the academically gifted." Briefly stated, the SEA test would allow the evaluators to assess whether the program was meeting its goals in the academic component.

Work on the SEA test began during the summer of 1979. Since the major steps in the construction of this instrument are discussed in the final evaluation report, it will not be necessary to detail the entire process again in this report. However, it is instructive to reiterate some of the work in order to put the meta evaluation that follows in as complete a context as possible. Here, then, are some of the major steps that led to the final critical thinking instrument, presented chronologically.

SUMMER: Reviewed Bloom's Taxonomy and other relevant literature (two weeks) . . . determined various ways of measuring each objective (two weeks) . . . wrote test items, five for each objective (one month) . . . piloted initial items informally on local middle school children to determine suitability of items . . . composed final form of pilot test (by mid-August) . . . divided pilot into three booklets, forms A, B and C.

FALL: Completed pilot test forms in September . . . mailed pilot instruments to Saginaw Township on October 1 . . . Pilot testing began on October 15 and lasted three weeks . . . Carolyn Callahan, Marty Aylesworth, Mary Crovo and Peggy Vanco conducted on-site visit on October 29 to observe testing and interview students on test readability, clarity of directions, and other information that would help in instrument revision . . . began item analysis, including testing a general education population in Spotsylvania County, Va. (tests administered on November 29.)

WINTER: Revised pilot test based on extensive data analysis . . . new items written by mid-March.

SPRING: Developed two parallel forms of final SEA test by mid-April . . . administered test to Saginaw Township students in May, and to gifted and talented students in six other school districts (three in Ohio, one in Texas, and two in Virginia) . . . received student information forms from the other six districts (achievement data, I.Q. scores of students tested, etc.) . . . received completed SEA tests from Saginaw Township on May 21.

SUMMER: Conducted data analysis.

That, briefly stated, is the chronology of events that led to the final version of the SEA test. In the following sections of the report, the activities outlined

above will be examined in greater detail. The purpose here is to give the reader an understanding of the sequence of tasks that were performed during the year, from the initial literature review in June through the final data collection and analysis a year later.

• OTHER EVALUATION ACTIVITIES: The construction of the SEA test was by no means carried out in isolation. While its gradual development was taking place, work on the other process and product objectives was also occuring. The following are some of the activities that took place:

-- worked throughout the year with Township staff to improve the quality of the academic program;

-- proposed methods of improving overall administration of the Enrichment Center project;

-- completed selection and development of instruments to measure student self-perception. This involved the selection of one existing instrument (the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Test), the modification of another (the School Sentiment Index), and the creation of a third (entitled "What Do You Know") to assess independence in learning, goal setting, responsibility, and personal competence. A design to evaluate the validity and reliability of the SSI and the WDYD was also completed. The Piers-Harris was administered in November, 1979, the SSI and WDYD in May of 1980.

-- worked with the project staff to develop the fine arts component in both the visual and performing arts areas. Work included helping staff to define and organize the curriculum in both areas; assisting the curriculum in both areas; assisting in the development of a student progress reporting system; developing procedures for student identification and selection; and collecting data throughout the year on curriculum from the fine arts staff. (Fine Arts classes, it should be noted, began on November 19.)

-- developed initial outlines for both the Curriculum Guide for the academic program and the Evaluation Manual.

-- devised a questionnaire to measure the amount and scope of parent knowledge regarding the Enrichment Center program. The questionnaire was designed to measure the impact of the three parent meetings held during the year.

-- assessed the impact of the Enrichment Center program on the teachers and administrators in Saginaw Township.

-- prepared a final evaluation report for the 1979-80 program.

In the following sections, these activities will be examined in greater detail. The purpose here is merely to list many of the activities undertaken during the year, and not to assess the quality of those activities.

III. PROCEDURES FOR META EVALUATION

A Definition. A meta evaluation, described in its most basic form, is an evaluation of an evaluation. It attempts to discover how well the initial, or "primary" evaluation was carried by holding it up to the light of critical investigation. A well-conceived meta evaluation answers the question: "How much faith can the consumer have in the original evaluation?"

The case for meta evaluation is a compelling one in today's setting. As Stufflebeam (1978) points out, a summative meta evaluation:

> ". . . sums up the overall merit of an evaluation, and it is usually done following the conclusion of a primary evaluation. It holds evaluators accountable by publicly reporting on the extent that their evaluation reports meet standards of good evaluation practice. Finally, summative meta evaluations help the audiences of primary evaluations determine how seriously they should take the primary evaluation's reported conclusions and recommendations."

If evaluation can be defined as the "assessment of merit," as Stufflebeam writes, then meta evaluation can be described as the "assessment of the merit of an evaluation." As he describes it, a meta evaluation assesses the extent to which an evaluation is:

1) Techniqually Adequate in revealing the merit of a given object;
2) Useful in guiding decisions;
3) Ethical in dealing with people and organizations; and
4) Practical in using resources.

As Stufflebeam has indicated, to be credible, a meta evaluation must judge the worth of an evaluation against a set of valid principles. Stufflebeam has developed the four categories listed above as broad areas of investigation. Those four categories contain a total of 34 standards (or dependent variables) that can be used for judging the worth of an evaluation.

Standards for Meta Evaluation. For the purposes of this study, we have narrowed the list to the 22 standards thought to have the most relevance to the Enrichment Center evaluation. Here, briefly stated, are the standards that will be used in this meta evaluation:

TECHNICAL ADEQUACY STANDARDS

Fulfillment of these standards means that an evaluation study reveals and conveys truthful information about the merit of the object of the evaluation. The standards in this category are:

1. Described Situation -- the environment in which the evaluation was conducted has been sufficiently identified and described that the environment influences on the study may be interpreted.

2. Authentic Situation -- the setting in which the study findings were obtained is sufficiently naturalistic that the findings can be applied in other practical settings.

3. Described Object -- the actual object of the evaluation has been sufficiently described that the audiences for the evaluation can determine what variations of the object are covered by the findings.

4. Described Sample -- the persons providing the data for the evaluation study have been sufficiently identified and described that the limitations of the study findings that are due to sampling problems may be assessed.

5. Representative Sample -- the persons providing the data for the evaluation study are typical of those persons to whom the study findings will be applied.

6. Valid Measurement -- what the data gathering instruments and methods, used in the study, actually measure has been sufficiently verified that these instruments and techniques are known to represent and predict findings in accordance with the intentions and conclusions of the study.

7. Reliable Measurement -- the data gathering instruments and methods, used in the study, give sufficiently similar results on successive trails that the audiences for the study can have confidence in the stability of the results.

8. Homogenous Scores -- the part scores that make up the total scores, that are presented in the report, give sufficiently non-contradictory results that the total scores may be considered to be aggregates of mutually reinforcing (internally consistent) part scores.

9. Appropriate Analysis -- the study's conclusions about attainments, correlations, and cause/effect relationships are backed up by appropriate analyses, i.e., analyses that identify and assess the study's sources of systematic, extraneous, and error variance, and that do not require unwarranted assumptions about the treatments, samples, or measures that were used in the study.

10. Unequivocal Reporting -- the evaluation report is sufficiently clear in the positions it presents on given issues that different members of the audience would have no doubt about the study's conclusions and recommendations.

11. Complete Reporting -- the total range of study findings is sufficiently reported that an examination of the study's basic data would reveal no findings that were not included in a technical report from the study.

ETHICAL STANDARDS

Fulfillment of these standards means that the study was conducted in a manner that evidences uncompromising adherence to the highest principles and ideals of the evaluation profession. The standards in this category are:

12. Ethical Measurement -- the measurement practices used in the study conform to the measurement principles and practices that have been endorsed by professional associations of evaluators (see especially the APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests, 1974.)

13. Honest Reporting -- the study's oral and written reports were free of subterfuge and duplicity and were candid in disclosing the weaknesses of the evaluation study.

UTILITY STANDARDS

Fulfillment of these standards means that an evaluation study produces and disseminates reports that inform practitioners and help them carry out their work. The standards in this category are:

14. Pertinent Information -- the information contained in the study reports is sufficiently pertinent to the interests and needs of the evaluations' audiences that they would rate the reports as relevant to their work.

15. Applicable Information -- the information contained in the evaluation reports is so applicable to the situations where the audience's work that they could act on the reported conclusions and recommendations.

16. Comprehensive Information -- the information contained in the study reports is of sufficient scope that evaluation's audiences would judge the reports to be adequate in their coverage of most pertinent questions about the object of the evaluation. [Depending on the interests and needs of the audiences, such questions may pertain to context, treatment, alternative treatments, process, outcomes (including side effects), costs casual inferences, and overall merit.]

17. Detailed Information -- the extent of detailed presentation for the different parts of the evaluation reports matches the audience's needs for general vs. in-depth information so well that they would judge the study to be effective in meeting their most important information requirements.

18. Credible Evaluators -- the persons conducting the study are sufficiently trusted by the members of each audience that they would initially suppose the findings to be accurate and free of bias and would assign high ratings to the credence of the study reports.

19. Balanced Information -- the evaluation reports are sufficiently equitable in their consideration of strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation that the audiences would view the evaluations as an impartial appraisal of worth as opposed to a jaundiced attack or a whitewash.

20. Timely Reporting -- the evaluation reports were released before, or at times when, the audiences needed them.

PRACTICALITY STANDARDS

Fulfillment of these standards means that the plan for conducting an evaluation is appropriate for use in the setting where the evaluation is to be carried out. The standards in this category are:

21. Operable Design -- the evaluation design is sufficiently feasible that its operating assumptions were met without undue effort or expense.

22. Cost/effective Results -- the evaluation results were sufficiently valuable that, given a full accounting of the costs involved in getting these results, the audiences would judge the outputs of the evaluation to be equal or greater in value than the value they would assign to the resources that they were expended in obtaining these results.

Data Collection. Data collected for this meta evaluation were obtained in the following ways:

1) On July 16-80, an evaluator visited the Evaluation Research Center in Charlotesville, Virginia, to conduct extensive interviews with each staff member of the primary evaluation team and to collect any and all relevant documents and materials.

2) The same evaluator interviewed the primary member of the Enrichment Center staff, Marie McKenna, in mid-August.

3) Two evaluators conducted a careful review of the final evaluation report prepared by the University of Virginia staff.

Data Analysis. The evaluation report will be reviewed in light of the 22 standards for judging the merit of evaluation studies reviewed above. Comments relating to strong, average, and weak aspects of the display of characteristics related to each standard will be reviewed. The evaluation report, the interview remarks of the program supervisor, plus information gained by the visit to the evaluation team at the University of Virginia will be used as sources of data. The major focus of the review will be the merits inherent in the evaluation report. After the strong, average, and weak aspects of each standard are reviewed, some summary statement about whether overall it appeared the evaluation report manifested a strong, average or weak standing on the standard will be made. A summary will be offered at the end of this review on the standing of all 22 standards.

In addition, the evaluation report will be compared to the objective analysis sheets included in the program proposal. All four process and nine product objectives will be reviewed with an eye toward answering the two following questions: Did the University of Virginia evaluation team complete all measurement, developmental assistance, and data analysis activities set forth on the objective analysis sheets? Secondly, did the conclusions on objective attainments reached by the original evaluation team agree with those reached by the meta evaluation team after they reviewed data submitted in the original evaluation report? A chart will be used to review the data collection/analysis activities and checks will be used to indicate whether these activities were attained, partially attained, or not attained. Comments will be made to help explain the attainment status of each activity. A summary will be offered over the 13 objectives breaking them into subparts similar to the original evaluation report when the academic, visual arts, and performing arts components of the program tend to become unique.

We believe this method will yield the most useful and understandable information to our various audiences.

IV. Comparison of Proposed Versus Actual Services

This chapter attempts to answer two questions:

1) Did the University of Virginia's Evaluation Team do what they originally subcontracted to do?

2) Would their account of events be substantially the same (say 90% agreement) if an outside team of evaluators would have reviewed the results using the same standards?

The proposed set of objective statements consisted of the four process and nine product objective analysis sheets (see Appendix) submitted with the Final Implementation Plan for 1979-80 for Middle School Enrichment Center Project Under ESEA, Title IV, Part C: Educational Innovation and Support. Each objective will be analyzed to determine what was and was not achieved with particular attention paid to the measurement and data analysis on the objective analysis sheets.

Process Objective 1: Develop and Implement Curriculum for Academically Talented Students.

A number of meetings to collect data and subsequent data analysis activities seem to have taken place. The chart below summarizes the achievement status of required and additional measurement/data analysis activities.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Consultant review form	X		Review of past two year's curriculum accomplished at December meeting
2. Teacher review	X		Curriculum guide questionnaire to teachers at November meeting
3. Unit feedback forms from students	X		Random sampling of students polled (29 of 50 students respond) about units
4. Unit feedback forms from teachers	X		Initially done by mail, but after poor results shown in February on-site visit feedback subsequently done by phone twice weekly.
Additional measurement/data analysis activities			
1. November 1, 1979 joint meeting of teachers and evaluation team	X		Program goals and curriculum guidelines result
2. Mid-February site visit	X		Activities reviewed failed to follow curriculum guides
3. Parent questionnaire about academic curriculum concerns	X		Program, seen as somewhat challengin and in need of only some improvement by parents of participating students
4. Questionnaire to parents of students who elected not to participate in the program or dropped out	X		Perception of these parents that program failed to provide in-depth study (7 of 19 parents)

A review of the chart above shows all four required activities plus at least four additional activities took place to develop the curriculum for the academically talented student. In the light that this process of development and implementation is ongoing into the 1980-81 school year, this objective seems to have been attained in terms of developing some workable procedures. If the proposed refinements of the process can be attained, a publishable curriculum guide along the lines of the curriculum guidelines seem possible. Our conclusion agrees with that of the original evaluation report.

Process Objective 2: Develop and Implement Curriculum for Talented Students in Fine Arts.

The chart below summarizes the achievement status of required and additional measurement/data analysis activities.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Consultant review forms		X	Little if any documentation was receive for review
2. Teacher review forms		X	By December only two activity cards from the visual arts program and none from performing arts. Subsequent activities yielded small amounts of token cooperation but the bulk of material sent could not be used due to not following guidelines.
3. Unit review forms from students	X		Student questionnaire results from a sample of students showed a positive response to the curriculum.
4. Unit review forms from artists		X	None mentioned, probably due to the fact that few if any units were complete
Additional measurement/data analysis activities			
1. November 1, 1979 meeting by evaluation staff stressing the importance of curriculum documentation	X		
2. December and February observations by evaluation staff	X		The instruction observed was well organized, appropriately sequenced and balanced between theory and practice in art.
3. Parent questionnaire about fine arts curriculum concerns	X		Parent questionnaire results from a sample of parents showed a positive re[illegible]e to the fine arts program

A review of the chart above shows only one of the four required activities was completed. In addition, at least three other major types of additional activities were undertaken. Even though the process of development and implementation is ongoing through the 1981-82 school year, it seems this objective was not attained in terms of working out documentation procedures for the fine arts curriculum. Our conclusion agrees with the original evaluation.

Process Objective 3: Develop and Implement Teacher/Administrator Inservice.

The evaluation report shows that the project administrator forwarded notices and adgendas for three types of activities considered to be teacher inservices for the project. However, the Virginia evaluators felt that these meetings were related to general awareness of when and where of Saginaw Township's program. The chart below summarizes activities related to the inservice process objective which sought to make teachers and administrators of the Saginaw Township Schools more knowledgeable about gifted and talented programs nationally and willing to encourage appropriate students to participate in the local program.

Required measurement/data analysis activity	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Project log was to document such activities were arranged.		X	Most meetings documented were operational for the present program. Inservices attended by teachers were to go into specifics of gifted and talented programs and hopefully positively present these programs to motivate teachers to talk about the program in the future.
Additional activities			
1. Needs assessment conducted in late fall by evaluation staff		X	Documented that middle school administrators and project staff lacked agreement on a local definition of "gifted and talented" and appropriate education for these students. No inservice undertaken to clarify these issues.
2. May 5, 1980 inservice lead by a state department representative and questionnaire about enrichment center activities.		X	Many negative reactions to the content and more so the timing of the inservice over gifted and talented program. With such a reaction it is questionable whether the inservice was valuable. This convinced the evaluation staff not to attempt further inservice efforts during the 1979-80 school year.

A review of the comments of the above chart shows that activities were attempted but the intent of fostering knowledge about gifted and talented students and support for active teacher participation in student identification met with failure. This inservice objective was not attained. Our conclusion agrees with the original evaluation.

Process Objective 4: Develop and implement an exportable parent program.

The chart below and on the following page summarizes progress toward attaining this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activity	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Locally developed parent questionnaire to be used at the end of each session		X	No data presented or statement made about its existence or lack of it.

Required measurement/data analysis activity	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
2. Log of parent participation to show that at least four meetings were held		X	Evaluation records indicate that at leas three scheduled meetings were held for parents of students in all three prograr No count of actual participation given. Newsletters and agendas show that a parent program existed but not to the extent suggested by the objective statement. No documentation shown about its exportability.
Additional measurement/data analysis activity			
1. Questionnaire after final parent meeting	X		The evaluation report states that only 15 of 200 possible parents responded to an instrument developed by the project direction due to the small number of responses it precludes interpretation. Product objective six provides questionnaire data from a larger sample of parents undertaken by the evaluation team.

At best this objective was partially attained. Our conclusion agrees with that of the original evaluation.

Product Objective 1: Write and Validate test or measurement tool related to critical thinking

The chart below summarizes progress toward attaining this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Pilot test of items			
a. calculate item analysis			
b. assess internal consistency	X		Form X = .69 and Form Y = .74
c. assess equivalent forms reliability	X		.76 for total scores
d. refine instrument and administer as post-test	X		
e. collect I.Q. data for use in construct validation	X		The construct validation study is noteworthy because it relates critical thinking to many other constructs other than I.Q. in a prior manner.
2. Assess content validity of instrument		X	No mention made of this study in evaluation report and phone call verified that no such study was undertaken.
3. Control group validation on refined instrument			
a. identify matched populations (one population in a gifted program, the second not in a program)	X		Data was gathered on a convenience sample of gifted and talented as mentioned below for items b-e. However, this activity did not constitute achievement of these items.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
b. administer refined instrument as post-test	X		Some testing using the refined instrume was undertaken on convenience samples of gifted students. No meaningful or procedure was used to allow reader to judge that matching was undertaken.
c. gather data on I.Q. and achievement	X		
d. assess equivalent forms reliability	X		
e. assess convergent/ discriminant validity	X		
Additional measurement/data analysis activities			
1. Pilot test of items on heterogeneous population in Central Virginia	X		
2. Pilot test of items in Saginaw township			
a. calculate inter rater reliabilities			
b. students interviewed on test readability, clarity of directions, perceived difficulty level, relevance, and degree or interest of reading passages	X		

A review of the above chart shows that of the eleven required activities only five (45.4%) were completed. In addition, three other additional test development efforts were undertaken. This objective appears to be partially attained. Our conclusion disagrees with the original evaluation which concluded that the objective was attained, even when we take into account the late start of the project's funding.

Product Objective 2: Write and validate test of measurement tool related to self-perception

The chart below and on the following page summarizes progress toward attaining this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Pilot of test items			
a. calculate item analysis data		X	
b. assess internal consistency	X		
c. refine instrument and administer as post-test	X		
d. collect I.Q. data for use in construct validation	X		

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
2. Assess content validity of instrument		X	
3. Control group validation on refined instrument			
a. identify matched populations to experimental (one population in a gifted program, the other not in a program)		X	For items a-d, control groups of students were located. Matching seemed to be less than adequate. No control group of gifted students not in a group was located. Items a-d were completed on a convenience sample of various gifted programs on different portions of the test.
b. administer refined instrument as post-test		X	
c. gather data on I.Q. and achievement		X	
d. assess convergent/ discriminant validity		X	

A review of the above chart reveals that of the ten required activities only three were completed as described on the objective analysis sheet. The two year timeline for development of the self-concept instrument disagrees with the one year timeline stated on the objective analysis sheet. This objective appears to be partially attained. Our conclusion disagrees with the original evaluation which concluded that the objective was attained.

Product Objective 3: Write and produce tests and evaluation procedure for the major curriculum units taught.

This objective was not attained due to a common agreement between program staff and evaluation staff that unit content tests would be inappropriate given the goals of both the academic and fine arts programs. From the prespective of the meta-evaluators, it seems that there still is a need for such tests or units and practice exercises if the concept of test is too overpowering to students. The argument that the creative process may be interfered with seems inappropriate. Any creative process, as shown by research in the area of creativity, has content knowledge as one of its basic building blocks. Our conclusion that the objective was not attained agrees with the original evaluation however, we feel the unit tests (or review exercises to monitor programs) still have a place and need to be developed. Such a change in curriculum design should have been explored at the State Department of Education level and amended at that level prior to the close of the project year.

Product Objective 4 (Academic): Develop forms and "report card" system for reporting of individual student progress.

The chart below and on the following page summarizes progress toward meeting this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Existence of forms	X		Two forms were developed
2. Existence of recording system	X		Forms sent home and placed in student files.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
3. Subjectively judged by 80% of parent support group as informative and adequate to provide them information on progress of their children.		X	Understandable = 90.5%. Provided all information parent wanted =38.1%
4. Judged by 100% of staff as valid for reporting progress.		X	Student comments made teacher feel students were unable to evaluate their own work as required by the system

From a review of the chart above, it is apparent that the academic portion of objective four was not attained. Our conclusion agrees with that of the original evaluation text.

Product Objective 4 (Fine Arts): Develop forms and "report card" system for reporting of individual student progress.

The chart below summarizes progress toward meeting this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Existence of forms	X		Self-referenced rating form
2. Existence of recording system	X		Procedure specified
3. Subjectively judged by 80% of parent support group as informative and adequate to provide them information on progress of their children.	Visual Arts X	Performing Arts X	Understandable - Visual Arts = 100% Performing Arts=88.9 Provided all information needed: Visual Arts= 86.7% Performing Arts=66.7
4. Judged by 100% of staff as valid for reporting purposes	X		Report described teacher reactions as generally pleased

From a review of the chart above, it is evident that the four criteria for success were met in the visual arts (objective attained) and not met in the performing arts where only three of four criteria were satisfied (objective not attained). Our conclusion agrees with those stated in the original evaluation report.

Product Objective 5: Write and outline format or blueprint for curriculum guide and evaluation manual.

The chart below and on the following page summarizes progress toward meeting this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Curriculum guide format for academic area	X		

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
2. Curriculum guide format for fine arts		X	This year only documentation of curriculum presently in use was undertaken with poor results.
3. Evaluation manual format	X		
4. Formats judged potentially useful by gifted/talented educators in other programs			
a. curriculum guide (academic)		X	Judgement of three programs not reported. Study still awaits completion with larger sample and revised instrument.
b. curriculum guide (fine arts)		X	
c. evaluation manual		X	No study reported on to judge utility of manual.

A review of the chart above reveals that only two of the six required elements for this objective were completed. Of the two formats completed, neither were judged potentially useful by gifted/talented educators. This objective was not attained. Our conclusion disagrees with that of the original evaluation report which states that the Academic Curriculum Guide and Evaluation Manual formats achieved the criterion; while the criterion was not achieved for the Fine Arts Curriculum Guide format.

Product Objective 6: Develop and write procedures for the identification and selection of gifted or potentially talented in fine or performing arts.

The chart below summarizes progress toward meeting this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Identification and selection procedures			
a. visual arts	X		
b. performing arts	X		
2. Students selected match at least 75% with those nominated by teachers			
a. visual arts	X		
b. performing arts		X	Classroom teacher nomination was deemed inappropriate. However, four judge agreement occurred on 50 of 60 (83.3%) identified. Classroom teacher nomination was again deemed inappropriate. Two judges were used but no statement as to level of agreement other than high was reported.

By examining the above chart, it is evident that three of four criteria related to product objective six were achieved. The issue of validation of selection procedures, especially in the area of performing arts still seems to be an issue. This objective was attained in visual arts and partially attained in the performing arts. Our conclusion disagrees with the original evaluation text which concluded that the objective was attained in both areas.

Product Objective 7: Demonstrate and involve students in production of art objects (visual arts) or performance of dramatic arts (drama).

The chart below summarizes progress toward this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Existence of curriculum in visual arts		X	Lacked other artists as models.
2. Existence of curriculum in performing arts	X		
3. Subjective judgement of project director that sufficient number of artists have been successful in relating to and motivating students			
a. visual arts		X	Lacked other artist(s) participation.
b. performing arts	X		

A review of the chart above indicates that product objective seven was achieved in the area of performing arts and not achieved in the area of visual arts. Our conclusion agrees with the original evaluation report.

Product Objective 8: Parents will understand the function of the program and will participate in the parent program to gain knowledge of the following: total scope of the gifted program, individual child's progress, and various activities relating to the program.

The chart below summarizes progress toward attaining this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Locally developed parent questionnaire about each of the parent inservice program in terms of knowledge about the following:			A final end of the year parent questionnaire was developed by the evaluation team rather than a locally developed instrument. It was sent to a random sample of 100 parents of which 50 returned the questionnaire. 98% of parents felt meetings were either very informative (48%) or somewhat informative (50%). 100% found enrichment center report card easy to understand 82% said they had attended at least one parent meeting. (Copy of questionnaire lacking from Appendix C of original evaluation report).
a. total program through parent meetings		X	
b. child's progress	X		
c. participation in program	X		

A review of the chart above shows that the parent program met two of the three criteria stated above. The objective was only partially attained. Our conclusion agrees with the original evaluation report. It is unfortunate that no documentation was kept on who attended the parent meetings. This is another reason why only partial attainment for this objective is warranted.

Product Objective 9: Local teachers (grades 5-8) will both understand the functioning of and participate in the gifted and talented program.

The chart below summarizes progress toward attaining this objective.

Required measurement/data analysis activities	Achieved	Not Achieved	Comments
1. Locally developed questionnaire (including both cognitive and attitude items)			
a. all teachers participate	X		Fifteen teachers completed survey
b. all teachers show positive attitude		X	Questionnaire data for items b and c were never collected due to the antagonistic response given to May 5, 1980 inservice by the 5-8 grade teachers.
c. teachers display cognitive knowledge about the program		X	

A review of the above chart makes it clear that this objective was not attained. Our conclusion agrees with that of the original evaluation text.

Summary

The chart below summarizes attainment status of the process and product objectives in terms of the original evaluation report and this metaevaluation report.

ATTAINMENT STATUS

Objective Type and number	Attained		Partially Attained		Not Attained	
	Original Evaluation	Meta Evaluation	Original Evaluation	Meta Evaluation	Original Evaluation	Meta Evaluation
Process 1	X	X				
2					X	X
3					X	X
4					X	X
Product 1	X			X		
2	X			X		
3					X	X
4(Academic)					X	X
4(Visual Arts)	X	X				
4(Performing Arts)					X	X
5(Academic/Evaluation Manual)	X					X
5(Fine Arts)					X	X
6(Visual Arts)	X	X				
6(Performing Arts)	X			X		
7(Visual Arts)					X	X
7(Performing Arts)	X	X				
8			X	X		
9					X	X

The above chart shows of the 18 objective related areas (some separately) that four or 22.2% show differences in attainment status between the original and meta evaluators interpretation of data presented.

Conclusion

The major intent of this chapter was to answer two questions. First, did the University of Virginia's Evaluation Team do what they originally subcontracted to do? The answer is not entirely. Their original evaluation report represented one statement of what they felt they completed. Our meta evaluation review objective by objective is a statement on what we feel was not completed. Failure to complete all the activities cannot be placed solely as a responsibility of the evaluation team from the University of Virginia, but must be shared to a large extent with the Saginaw Township School District Administration.

Maybe the second question stated to be answered in this chapter is more appropriate. Whether their account of events would be substantially the same (say 90% agreement) if an outside team of evaluators would have reviewed the same results using the same standards? Agreement in attainment status by objective is 77.8% as shown in the above chart.

Where the major difference comes in using attainment status categories is summarized in the chart below. This chart shows the 18 objective-related areas shown earlier now in a matrix that compares the original and meta evaluation to attainment status categories.

Evaluation Source	ATTAINMENT STATUS			
	Attained	Partially Attained	Not Attained	Total Objectives
Original Evaluation	8	1	9	18
Meta Evaluation	4	4	10	18

As can be seen in the above chart, the areas of attained and partially attained are where the greatest disagreement results.

The original evaluators used the partially attained status only once while the meta evaluators thought it was appropriate at least on three additional occassions.

V. Presentation and Analysis of Data

This chapter is devoted to reviewing the merits of the 1979-80 Evaluation Report of Saginaw Township Community Schools' Middle School Enrichment Center: Gifted and Talented Program. Specifically, the goal of this chapter will be to assess the extent that the final evaluation effort is technically adequate; ethical in dealing with people and/or organizations; useful in guiding decisions; and practical in using resources. Overall 22 standards will be grouped under the four broad headings mentioned above. Under each standard the strong, average, and weak points related to attaining that standard will be reviewed. At the conclusion of this review, a summary by the four broad headings will be offered.

Presentation and Analysis of Data: Technical Adequacy Standards

1. Described Situation. Strong, average and weak aspects of the described situation are listed below.

Strong -

- Explanation and needs assessment documentation of teacher/administrator lack of expertise in principles of curriculum development.
- Explanation of the unique nature of this Title IV project in which the evaluation component comprised a major portion of the expenditure.

Average -

- Explanation of why a meta-evaluation was necessary.
- Explanation of the unique arrangement between a LEA, SEA, and the University of Virginia.

Weak

- Failure to describe the poor financial situation the Saginaw Township Schools were in the Spring, 1980 as one possible reason for antagonistic teacher response to gifted and talented inservice on May 5, 1980 by state department representative, when other seemingly more important programs were being cut.
- Demographic description of what the Saginaw Township Schools were like with respect to race, social economic status, etc.

On the whole, an above average job was done by the original evaluation report in describing the situation in which the evaluation was done. The one thing that would help an outsider would be a description of the Saginaw Township Schools.

2. Described Object. An average job was done by the original evaluators in describing the present state of developmental work done to date on processes of products to be evaluated. The entire nature of the operation of the program is summarized in figure 1 on page 8. The narration that follows in the text and more detailed description in Appendix C of figure 1 may prove to confuse rather than make completely clear the goals, objectives, and nature of the project plus the role of various actions. In the curriculum development and testing portions, summaries are given of what has been done, if anything. The reader however, is not given a sample of past work which would have made a stronger statement of the described object more possible.

3. Described Sample. Strong, average and weak aspects of the described sample are listed below.

Strong

Average -

- Phrases as "30% random sample of parents" fail to give the reader an idea of how randomness was assured in the sampling procedure.

Weak -

- The following samples for the reliability and validity studies of the SEA test were inadequately described (e.g. ses, race, age, I.Q., achievement test level, etc.)

- Original Saginaw sample on pilot SEA test; Heterogeneous Virginia sample; post-test Saginaw test group refined SEA instrument and other gifted and talented populations tested on the refined SEA and various other measures.

- Parents samples were not described in terms of important dimensions such as the following:

  School attendance area of residence and number of parent meetings attended.

- Student sample was not described in terms of important dimensions such as the following:

  Sex, grade, and school.

On the whole, a weak job was done by the original evaluation report in describing the sampling process.

4. Representative Sample. Strong, average and weak aspects of the representativeness of samples employed are discussed below.

   Strong

   Average

   Weak -

- Randomness of samples were assumed to provide representativeness of samples chosen, but no documentation was offered for drawing this conclusion (e.g. parent sample - was it stratified by school like the student population or not?). Further, how was the responding group stratified, since they represented only half of the original sample.

- No reported attempt to follow up on non-respondents to questionnaire studies was made. This would allow the reader to determine the characteristics of non-respondents in relation to the respondents.

No visible means were used to assure for the representativeness of samples employed.

5. Valid Measurement. Strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of validity are discussed below.

   Strong -

- The general nomological network of the critical thinking skills (synthesis, evaluation, and analysis) and related hypotheses provided a good basis to explore construct validity for the SEA test. The present results of the

construct validity study show agreement on the following areas: sex, I.Q. on gifted population, age, grade, and Ross test. (Tentative, see comment in the "Weak" section below.) Areas showing disagreement related to the construct of the SEA test were the following: verbal achievement, math achievement, self concept and attitude toward school within a gifted population. Areas still to be explored for agreement were the following: I.Q. on a moderate population, attitude toward school within a heterogeneous population, attitude toward gifted and Ross test.

Average -

- Parent and student questionnaires were piloted to help provide for valid measurement related to product and process objectives.

Weak -

- This was the critical construct comparison (moderate to high correlation predicted) and the failure to test the strength of the relationship between the Ross and SEA tests across all grades and program sites of interest makes any statement of the construct validity vary tentative. Construct validity verification was weak on Ross tests because these tests were administered to only one fifth grade group at one of the township's middle schools. The fifth grade results showed a moderate positive relationship between the Ross and SEA tests (Form x, r = .65, p = .0, and Form yr = .52, p - .05).

- Content validity study based on expert opinion was never undertaken.

- Validation of the screening and identification process was never undertaken.

- No nomologinal network was provided for the constructs measured on the SSI and the WDYD.

- No validity study was undertaken for Piers - Harris.

Generally less than adequate information was provided in the evaluation report.

6. Reliable Measurement Discussion about strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of reliability follow.

Strong -

- Agreement of judges for the selection and screening process for the performing arts was within the high range (r = .83).

Average -

- Equivalent form reliability estimates for SEA test were calculated but correlations appeared to be in a moderate range rather than the high range as predicted.

Weak -

- Data on the agreement of judges for the selection and screening process for the visual arts were not supplied.

- Failure to calculate the stability estimates for the SEA test were noted.

On the whole, an average job was done by the original evaluation team in providing for reliable measurement.

7. Homogeneous Scores. Discussion about strong, average, and weak aspects of claims related to homogeneous scores follow.

Strong -

- KR-20 internal consistency estimates for SSI were calculated and found to be in a high range (r = .91).

Average -

- Internal consistency estimates of reliability for the SEA test were calculated but correlations appeared to be in a moderate range rather than the high range as predicted.

Weak -

- Internal consistency estimates of reliability for the WDYD and Piers - Harris tests were not calculated.

Generally an average job seems evident in the area of providing honogeneous scores when the original evaluation text was reviewed.

8. Appropriate Analysis. Discussion about strong, average, and weak aspects of claims related to appropriate analysis follow.

Strong

Average -

- If for the moment, the problems related to appropriateness of samples can be ignored, then, a fair job was done in using tests of significance, correlations, and factorial analyses to answer hypothesized questions about the SEA, the SSI, and the WDYD tests. However, the evaluations fail to operationally define low medium and high ranges of correlations initially or after the fact define the meanings of these ranges of correlations when they spoke of their findings.

Weak -

- No explanation why 30% sample of parents chosen in one part of study (process objective 1) and 50% sample of parents chosen in another part of study (product objective 8). Why is accuracy more appropriate in one case over another?

- No explanation of why there was no follow-up of non-respondent parents (for parent samples mentioned above) when 42% to 50% of parents polled failed to return their questionnaires. Are respondent and non-respondents alike?

- When sample results were reported, only the percentages giving the various responses to a question are reported, instead of actual number of responses. Thus, it is difficult to determine the significance to be assigned to the various percentages without also knowing the number of actual respondents to each question.

- Because of the failure to describe the samples adequately, unwarranted assumptions about the representativeness of the bulk of the samples employed are necessary when speaking of attainment of objectives.

- Product objective five (developing format for curriculum guides and evaluation manual) was classified as attained even though the evaluators never reported judgements from other gifted and talented educators about its potential usefulness

as required by the objective statement.

Overall, less than adequate information was provided in the evaluation report making it difficult to determine if appropriate analysis was done.

9. Unequivocal Reporting. Discussion of strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of unequivocal reporting follows.

   Strong -

   - Conclusions and recommendations related to the following areas seems to be sufficiently clear to both Saginaw Township Schools and the Michigan Department of Education: Test development and validation efforts; parent participation; fine arts identification process; teacher inservice; student reporting system; and general fund support of the gifted and talented program.

   Average

   Weak -

   - Conclusions and recommendations related to the development of the curriculum guides and the evaluation model seems weakened by the lack of involvement from gifted and talented educators at the local level outside of Saginaw Town- Schools.

Overall, it appears that the original evaluation report did a better than average job in relating its conclusions and recommendations.

10. Complete Reporting. Strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of complete reporting are described below.

    Strong

    Average

    Weak -

    - Failure to report judgements of gifted and talented educators related to the potential utility of curriculum and evaluation manual formats.
    - Failure to describe rationale for, composition of, and selection procedures for samples used in various aspects of the project.
    - Failure to contrast results of supervisor designed study and evaluation team study of parental participation in gifted and talented informational sessions.
    - Failure to provide a copy of all the questions on the parent and student questionnaire which was supposed to have been in the appendix C.

On the whole, this area of complete reporting seems to be handled less than adequately the original evaluation text. This is not to say that strong and average areas of complete reporting could not be made, but they would have had to be qualified by one or more of the failures mentioned above.

11. Objective Evaluators. Strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of objective evaluators are listed below.

    Strong -

    - The evaluation team represented a group of outside gifted and talented educators and evaluation specialists who brought new respectives to

developing and evaluating a program housed in a local school district. This meant that curriculum specialist could work closely with evaluators such that they both could act as check and balance system on the reality orientation of both.

Weak -

- The evaluation team produced products which they in time had to evaluate. Being so close to the developmental effort can cause short sightedness. This happened with the development of the curriculum and evaluation manual formats. The documents were produced and most probably met the potential utility standards of the developers. However, they failed to report the potential utility of these documents for a sample of gifted and talented educators as outlined in product objective five. Even though this necessary step was not completed, the evaluation text states that this objective was attained.

Generally it appears that the objectivity of the evaluators was impaired somewhat by being in both the role of developers and the evaluators.

Presentation and analysis of data standards for ethics in dealing with people and/or organizations.

12. Ethical Measurement. Strong, average and weak aspects of claims of ethical measurement are discussed below. Items in parantheses refer to the 1974 Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests published by the American Psychological Association.

Strong -

- Full description of the developmental effort of the SEA test (A-2).
- The manual should indicate the extent to which the proposed interpretation (of the construct) has been substantiated and should summarize investigations of the hypothesis derived from theory (E 13.1). This seems to be the case with the SEA test.
- Estimate of comparability of forms should be given (F4). This seems to be the case with SEA test.
- Evidence of internal consistency should be reported for any unspeeded test (F5). This seems to be the case with SEA and SSI test.

Weak -

- Samples employed in the validity studies and the conditions under which testing is done should be consistent with recommended test use and should be described sufficiently for the reader to judge its pertinence to his situation (E 6). This standard seems to be lacking.
- If validity (content) for some suggested interpretation has not been investigated, that fact should be made clear (E 1).
- If the validity sample is made up of record accumulated haphazardly or voluntarily, then the probable selective factors and their presumed influence on the test variable should be stated (E72)
- Construct validity as summarized in (E13.1) is lacking for the SSI and WDYD test.
- The procedures and samples used to determine realiability coefficients should be described sufficiently to permit a user to judge the applicability of the data reported to the individuals or groups which he is concerned (F 2).
- Internal consistency is lacking for both the Piers - Harris and WDYD test (F 5).

Overall the validity and reliability studies carried out in the original evaluation were weakened whem compared with ehtical measurement standards. This area is weakened because of missing description of samples used to study these validity and reliability claims.

13. Honest Reporting

Strong -

- Reporting of the weakness of construct validation on Ross tests because of use only in fifth grade at one site.
- Explanation why refined SEA test not given as pre-test measure.

Average -

- Admits to the need for further validation of the screening and selection process for the fine arts program. Even though earlier in the report the objective was incorrectly reported as being attained.

Weak -

- Failure to provide a utility review of curriculum and evaluation manual formats by competent outside judges. This would provide additional ideas on how to improve these formats in the next two years of development in terms of the experiences of their gifted and talented educators.
- Failure to mention lack of con[illegible]eview by outside expert.

An average job was done by the evaluators in the honest reporting of results.

Presentation and Analysis of Data: Standards for Utility in Guiding Decisions

14. Pertinent Information. Strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of providing pertinent information are discussed below.

Strong -

- The information seems pertinent to the needs of Saginaw Township in terms of next steps for curriculum development and parent and professional staff involvement.

Average -

- The evaluation report lets both the township schools and the department of education know that further efforts are necessary in developing the reporting system of progress, selection procedures for the fine arts program, and community participation in the fine arts program.

Weak -

- The information provided over the test development and validation efforts seem less than complete from a Department of Education viewpoint. The State Department was hoping for technical manuals related to the SEA, SSI, WDYD, and Piers - Harris for gifted/talented population. However, the information while being pertinent is not complete enough so it can evaluate the tests.

An average job was done in providing pertinent information through the original evaluation report.

15. Applicable Information. Discussion of strong, average and weak aspects of claims of applicable information follow.

Strong -

- From the comments made during our interviews of township staff, it seemed quite evident that conclusions and recommendations related to all major program components were understood and being considered to be employed. They seemed quite pleased that their curriculum developmental efforts were being better received than last year when many students dropped out of the program due to lack of interest. The township credits a lot of this change to the involvement of the people from the University of Virginia.

Agerage

Weak -

- A better than average job was done in presenting applicable conclusions and recommendations that went directly to resolve problems encountered in attaining objectives of interest to the township.

16. Comprehensive Information. Strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of comprehensive information are listed below

Strong -

- A good deal of information exists to explain the development of the test instruments.

Average

Weak -

- Information seems to be lacking about what experts would say about the content of test instruments and curriculum/evaluation guides.

- Information seems lacking about how other methods of identifying critical thinkers and fine arts participants agree with the SEA test and selection procedures for the visual/performing arts respectively.

- There seems to be a lack of information about what attempts were made to secure information about parent teacher and administrative meetings. We read in the report the evaluation team was aware the meetings had taken place but little concern is shown about their responsibility to evaluate these meetings through data collected. Were attempts made by means of phone calls or letters made to secure data? Did evaluators offer their services to design some type of forms to help collect this needed data? These and many other questions are left unanswered.

- Information is lacking in the report about the nature of the parent and teacher groups that respond to various instruments (e.g. Parent and Student Questionnaire, SEA test, etc.)?

- Little, if any, information is offered about substituted standards for objectives that are found to lack workable criteria.

- Information was lacking about how many parents attended parent meetings.

The information presented answer many questions, but some of the key questions posed in the above listing fail to be answered in the evaluation text. Because of this inability to answer these questions, the meta evaluation team feels the original evaluation report is weak in terms of comprehensive information.

17. Detailed Information. Discussion of strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of detailed information follow.

Strong -

- More than adequate data are given about the following areas of the program: teacher and administrator inservice activities, identification and selection procedures in the fine arts, community linkage provided, the reporting system for student progress, and piloting and selected developmental efforts related to the SEA test.

Average

Weak -

- Saginaw township officials probably wanted to know how other gifted and talented educators would rate the work done on their SEA test, academic curriculum guide, and evlauation manual. This information is lacking in any detail from the original evaluation text.

- Detailed information was lacking on how a matched sample of gifted/talented students from the township compared on the SEA, SSI, WDYD, and Piers - Harris tests.

Overall an adequate job was done in presenting detailed information in the original evaluation test. This is very apparent with instances of more than adequate information versus instances of a complete lack of information to guide decision makers. This is especially true if the decision makers used the evaluation report as their only guide to the program.

18. Credible Evaluators. Discussion of strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of credible evaluators follow.

Strong -

- When interviewed, Saginaw township school administrators related that their sense of trust in the evaluation team came about due to the knowledge about gifted and talented education displayed by the consultants. The consultants were always open to new questions posed by the township as they furthered the development of the 1979-80 gifted and talented program.

- The intense work sessions during the on-site visits added to the trusting relationship developed. Though the great physical distance between the township schools and the evaluation team kept the actual number of visits of the evaluation less than the number desired by the evaluation team, the quality of these on-site visits were never in question in the opinion of the township staff. In addition, phone conversations related to problems and progress of the program were being made at the rate of more than two per week during the second semester of this program year

Average

Weak -

- From the responses of the gifted and talented Saginaw township staff, it seemed evident that a better than average job was done in establishing rapport and credibility of the evaluation team.

19. Balanced information. Strong, average and weak aspects of claims of balanced information are listed below.

Strong -

- A good job was done in presenting balanced information about the student selection and identification procedure in showing it involved multiple people but still needs some further steps overall to show proof for its validity.

Average -

- The following areas seem to have a balance of strengths and weaknesses: SEA, SSI, and WDYD test development efforts; fine arts curriculum development effort; teacher and administrator inservice; community linkage to the fine arts program; and student reporting system.

Weak -

- The evaluation report did not mention the lack of an expert review of the claims of content validity.

- The evaluators in their report were unwilling to present questionnaire results about parent meetings gathered by the program supervisor due to the small number involved even though these might have been the most active and involved parents. Rather they reported results from their questionnaire study of 100 parents of which only 50 returned their questionnaires. In addition, the evaluation team failed to follow-up to find out what non-respondents were like.

- Failure to present survey results of other gifted and talented evaluators when questioned about the potential utility of the academic curriculum guide. Even if the entire data from the three program directors was not analyzed some preliminary information from one or two key questions still should have been presented to give us a flavor of their comments.

- No attempt at all was made to explore the potential utility of the evaluation manual with other gifted and talented program directors. Wouldn't their ideas have helped in the development of the evaluation guide?

- The decision to do nothing about developing some evaluation of knowledge obtained through each unit of academic study seems unfortunate. Some comprise attempt to gather some useage information about student progress through a unit of content short of a test could have attempted.

Overall, an adequate job was done with presenting balanced information in the evaluation report by the original evaluation team.

20. Timely reporting. Strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of timely reporting are listed below.

Strong -

- Saginaw Township Community Schools set August 15, 1980 as the due date for the evaluation because this would allow them time to review the findings and recommendations before school started. When interviewed, the administration of the township's gifted and talented program was very pleased to receive the evaluation report earlier than the due date on August 4, 1980.

Average

Weak -

It appears that a more than adequate job was done in producing a timely report in the opinion of the township schools.

Presentation and Analaysis: Practicality Standards

21. Operable Design. Discussion of strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of operable evaluation design follow.

Strong -

- Evaluation designs for product objective 7 involving the project directors decision about adequate community participation from those skilled in the fine arts proved workable.

- Evaluation design for product objective four (gifted/talented student reporting system) which used a parent and teacher questionnaire seemed quite workable.

Average -

- The evaluation team modified the data collection/analysis scheme from following each parent meeting to one involving collecting data at the end of the parent meeting to one involving collecting data at the end of the parent meetings by use of mailed-out questionnaire for product objective 8. A similar modification occured with product objective 9 related to teacher and administrator inservices.

Weak -

- The criterion for success in selecting students for the talented program (product objective 6) of teacher nomination agreement of at least 75% proved unworkable.

- Matched control groups (one within a gifted and talented program and one outside of a gifted and talented program) were never located and used in conjunction with test development efforts of product objectives 1 and 2.

- Curriculum expertise and prior curriculum development efforts of the academically gifted township staff member proved to be very limited. Thus the consultants from the University of Virginia had to invest more time and energy in this portion of the project at the expense of other contracted services.

- The development of the unit tests (product objective 3) proved unnecessary by mutual agreement of township and University of Virginia consultants. Communication of this modification to the State Department of Education (funding agent) seemed lacking.

- Evaluation team failed to report whether gifted/talented educators in other programs judged curriculum guide and evaluation manuals as potentially useful through subjective analysis (product objective 5).

Overall the evaluation design is somewhat less than adequate.

22. Cost Effective Results. Discussion of strong, average, and weak aspects of claims of cost effective evaluation results follow.

Strong -

- To have a program to evaluate that brings about consistent results, you first need to have a curriculum that is both workable for the teaching staff and motivating to students. Saginaw township's gifted program lacked this in the past. However, the work in conjunction with the University of Virginia done this year makes both necessities for consistent results more likely. Questionnaire results of students

in both academic and fine arts seemed to show interest in the program. Through a great deal of work on a part of people from the University of Virginia the academic curriculum is in draft form. This is very valuable from the comments made by the Saginaw Township administrators.

- The SEA test was another desired product. However, since the final program still is not in place it still is not essential that its development be complete. A refined version does exist and it seems like future steps will do much to improve this instrument. Administrators at Saginaw Township seem pleased with the progress made on the SEA test as well as the collection of instruments that comprise the self-perception test.

Average -

- An average job was done in evaluating the community linkage, parent program, teacher and administrator inservice program, identification and selection of fine arts students, and the student reporting system. Township officials feel the costs expended were worth the improved effectiveness in these secondary components of the program.

Weak

The two major components of the program (curriculum development in the academic area and test development in critical thinking) are well along. The efforts of the evaluators seem cost effective to the Saginaw Township Community Schools.

Summary

The chart below shows whether the original evaluation report was rated strong, average, or weak when compared to the 22 standards for judging the merit of evaluation studies. The chart also presents the 22 standards divided into one of the four classes of standards - technical adequacy, ethical, utility, or practicality.

Classes of Standards	Strong	Average	Weak
Technical adequacy	Described situation Unequivocal reporting	Described object Reliable measurement Homegeneous scores	Described sample Representative sample Valid measurement Appropriate Analysis Complete reporting Objective evaluators
Subtotal	2	3	6
Ethical		Hohest Reporting	Ethical measurement
Subtotal	0	1	1

Classes of Standards	Strong	Average	Weak
Utility	Applicable Information Credible Evaluators Timely Reporting	Pertinent Information Detalied Information Balanced Information	Comprehensive Information
Subtotal	3	3	1
Practicality	Cost Effective Results		Operable Design
Subtotal	1	0	1
Grand Total	6	7	9

As you can see from a review of the chart above, the original evaluation report is rated overall as follows: 6 strong, 7 average, and 9 weak marks on the 22 evaluation standards. The greatest number of strong standards came in the class of utility standards where 3 standards (applicable information, credible evaluators and timely reporting) are rated strong out of a total of 7 (43%). The greatest number of weak standards came in the class of technical adequacy standards where 6 interrelated standards (described sample, representative sample, valid measurement, appropriate analysis, complete reporting, and objective evaluators) are rated weak out of a total of 11 (55%).

VI. Summary of Findings

The purpose of this meta evaluation is to examine the overall merit of the primary evaluation of the Saginaw Township Enrichment Center project, conducted by the University of Virginia's Evaluation Research Center. This meta evaluation, to reiterate a point made in chapter III, is designed to hold "evaluators accountable by reporting on the extent that their evaluation reports meet standards of good evaluation practices."

This evaluation examined the work of the Evaluation Research Center from several angles:

-- an onsite visit to the University of Virginia to interview staff and review documents.

-- a thorough review of the final evaluation report and related documents.

-- an interview with the key Enrichment Center staff member in Saginaw Township.

Here is a summary of each:

Onsite visit. The onsite visit to the Research Center was made in mid-July and included two days of interviews with the five key members of the evaluation team. The media evaluator found the following:

-- An enthusiastic and professional staff that appeared to enjoy its work and was committed to the project.

-- A staff that was knowledgable in both gifted and talented education and program evaluation.

-- An efficient deployment of staff, with tasks and responsibilities assigned in a logical manner.

-- Good record keeping practices.

-- Staff members who were willing and able to share records, documents, and other relevant information with the meta evaluator, and who talked openly about all aspects of their work.

From what was learned during the onsite visit, it was apparent that the Evaluation Research Center staff had done a lot of work on the project and was committed to making it a success. It was also apparent that they had a solid, working relationship with the Saginaw Township staff. From talking with the Evaluation Research Center staff and reviewing documents, it was evident that, despite the distance between the two units, communication was good. The evaluators kept in constant phone contact with project staff -- usually three times per week -- and had very few idle moments when they made onsite visits to the Township. The agendas for onsite visitations were filled from morning to night with various activities.

In all, the onsite visit to the University of Virginia yielded a picture of a committed professional, and enthusiastic staff that seemed to place a great deal of emphasis on this particular project.

Document Review. A review of the final evaluation report and related documents is discussed in detail in sections four and five. The reader is directed to review the information in those two sections in some detail to obtain a clear and more balanced picture of the overall evaluation effort.

In summarizing the findings, several statements need to be made in order to gain a clear perspective. These statements, or overall findings, are presented below. Both strong points and weak points of the evaluation are listed:

Strong Points

1. The evaluation report provided useful information in guiding decisions.

2. The work done by the Evaluation Research Center staff was cost effective. The Township, for the most part, received the services for which it contracted -- and in some cases they received more than they contracted for.

3. The Evaluation Research Center staff is well on its way to providing a sound critical thinking instrument; which was the major focus of year one's efforts.

4. The evaluators also have worked to bring about major improvements in the project's academic curriculum, particularly in terms of organizing a logical and comprehensive set of goals and objectives.

5. There appeared to be a free flow of information between the Evaluation Research Center staff and the Township staff with respect to the academic curriculum development component.

6. The recommendations made in the final evaluation report were a valuable contribution to program improvement and were supported by the data.

7. The final evaluation report was delivered before the due date, of August 15, making it possible for the Township staff to plan 1980-81 activities in light of the information contained in the report.

Weak Points

While the evaluation conducted by the University of Virginia contained a number of strengths, it also contained some notable weaknesses. These weaknesses were found most often in the mechanics of the evaluation work reported by the Evaluation Research Center staff. They include:

1. An inadequate description of the samples used in conducting the reliability and validity studies and also in the samples drawn for the student and parent questionnaires.

2. Lack of involvement of outside experts in reviewing the further development of the critical thinking test and curriculum/evaluation guides.

3. Selective reporting of questionnaire and survey data (ie. parent questionnaire results collected by the project supervisor) was evident.

4. Incomplete reporting of information related to tasks necessary to attain objectives (ie. content/validity studies). Without complete reporting, it is difficult for readers to determine the attainment status of objectives and further raises questions as to the efficacy of the reporting procedures of the report.

5. Inadequate description of questionnaire results which among other things involved not conducting follow-up studies of non-respondents (non-response rates between 50% to 58%) and railure to report numbers responding to each question (this is especially needed because the report seemingly involved a number of different questionnaire studies).

6. The free flow of information that was evident in the academic curriculum development component was not evident in the fine arts curriculum development component, parent involvement component, and teacher/administrator inservice component. Although the meta evaluators realize that at times it does become difficult to collect information, some data collection system can usually be developed.

The responsibility of this poor communications must still rest with both parties.

Township Interview. In late August, after the final evaluation report had been delivered to the Township staff, an interview was conducted with the key Township staff member, Marie McKenna. Ms. McKenna was the primary contact person for the evaluation team and worked closely with them throughout the year. The interview had two purposes:

1. to obtain her impressions of the work done by the University of Virginia evaluation team, and

2. to provide a check on the information gathered from the University of Virginia evaluation team.

The information provided by Ms. McKenna corroborated what was learned during the onsite visit to the Evaluation Research Center. She said she was more than pleased with the work done by the evaluation team, with their commitment to the project, their knowledge of the subject matter, and their accessibility.

She said the evaluation staff provided her and the project with valuable services throughout the year and that the final evaluation report was both an accurate assessment of the project and a valuable resource for future planning. She said there was never a problem with finding answers to problems or concerns as they arose, and that the help they provided in developing the academic component was invaluable.

Asked to give the evaluation team an overall grade for their work, she gave them an A-.

VII. Conclusion

Based on the evidence gathered and analyzed in this report, it is the belief that the Evaluation Research Center evaluation team made a valuable contribution to Saginaw Township's Enrichment Center Project. Certainly, the project is better off as a result of their efforts, particularly in two primary areas:

1. the development of the critical thinking test, and
2. the strengthening of the academic component.

While problems were apparent in a number of areas -- as noted in sections 4 and 5 -- it is the belief of the meta evaluators that these deficiencies can be corrected in the coming year by the evaluation team.

In the following section, a series of recommendations are presented that we hope will help to strengthen future evaluation efforts.

VIII. Recommendations

1. More attention should be given to defining populations, giving rationales for sample sizes, operationally describing sampling procedures, describing obtained samples, and, if warranted, carrying out follow-up studies of non-respondents. While projects of this size and complexity often place enormous demands on evaluators in terms of just getting out the major findings, it is important that they not lose sight of such techniques as the ones listed above. Often times, these techniques aid the reader in knowing whether the data are representative of the population of interest and how much credibility to assign to the findings themselves.

2. A content validy study of the final critical thinking instrument (SEA test) should be undertaken as specified in the original contract. If such a study is inappropriate at the time of the next evaluation report, then that should be stated along with the reason(s) why it seems inappropriate.

3. To meet the technical needs of future users (or funding agency), a technical manual should be written to document the developmental efforts and the studies undertaken to determine validity and reliability of this instrument with gifted/talented populations. This is especially important because the SEA test is a pioneering instrument in the area of middle school gifted and talented. Other districts, as well as the State Department of Education, would benefit greatly from such information.

4. Future evaluation reports could be improved by the use of relevant charts and tables in the body of the report. Such a reporting format would enable the reader to more easily follow the information presented. Long narrative passages are difficult to follow and assimimulate.

5. Since the final evaluation report was so lengthy, and so much data were presented, it would be helpful to provide an abstract of the major points of the report so that a variety of audiences could share the information. A report of several hundred pages is too long and too detailed for board members, members of the teaching staff, and parents. A concise summary of the report's highlights would be helpful in reaching a wider audience.

6. ALTHOUGH CHAPTER 5, IN PARTICULAR, TENDS TO BE CRITICAL OF MANY PROCEDURES AND OUTCOMES REPORTED IN THE FINAL EVALUATION STUDY, WE WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT ON THE WHOLE THE EVALUATION RESEARCH CENTER STAFF DID A COMMENDABLE JOB UNDER DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES. THE WEAKNESSES WE NOTED MAY HAVE BEEN, IN MANY INSTANCES, THE RESULT OF INCOMPLETE REPORTING, AND SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AS A REFLECTION ON THE PROFESSIONALISM OF THE PRIMARY EVALUATORS, WHO ARE HIGHLY QUALIFIED AND HIGHLY COMPETENT INDIVIDUALS. IT IS OUR HOPE THAT THE CRITICISM LISTED IN THIS REPORT WILL MAKE THE EVALUATION TEAM MORE AWARE OF THE EXPECTATIONS AND THE INFORMATION NEEDS OF CRITICAL READERS OF THIS REPORT. WITH THAT SAID, THE META EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CONTINUE ITS WORK WITH SAGINAW TOWNSHIP FOR THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT. A GOOD START HAS BEEN MADE.

APPENDICES

VITA

Carolyn M. Callahan, Associate Professor
Department of Foundations, School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

October, 1979

PERSONAL DATA:

Date of Birth: March 16, 1947
Marital Status: Single, no children

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

State University of New York at Albany, 1965-67
University of Connecticut, B.A. (Mathematics), 1969 (Highest Honors)
University of Connecticut, M.A. (Educational Psychology), 1970
University of Connecticut, Ph.D. (Educational Psychology), 1973

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Evaluator of Curriculum Development Project, School of Nursing, University of Connecticut, 1972-73.
Lecturer - Research Methods, School of Nursing, University of Connecticut, 1972.
Graduate Research Assistant, University of Connecticut, 1969-72.
Follow-up Evaluation of Manchester Community College Graduates, 1971-72.
Evaluation of Project IMPROVE, ESEA Title III grant, 1971-72.
Evaluation Consultant - Title VI - Movement Education Project, Capital Region Education Council, Hartford, Connecticut, 1973.
Evaluation Consultant - Challenge III - Charlottesville High School, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1974-75.
Curriculum Consultant - Gifted Program - Charlottesville City School System, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1975 - present.
Reviewer for Publication - McGraw Hill Publishing Company, 1974-76; Prentice-Hall, 1976-77; Brooks-Cole, 1976; Wadsworth, 1978; Merrill, 1978.
Curriculum Consultant to Henrico County Gifted Program, Henrico County, Virginia, 1974-75.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (CONTINUED):

Member of Editorial Board and Review Editor for Education Unlimited (1978-present).
Review Editor for Exceptional Children (1978-present).
Review Editor for Teaching Exceptional Children (1977-present).
Reviewer for Improving Human Performance: A Research Quarterly.
Contributor to Standards of Educational Evaluation (proposed publication of American Psychological Association and American Educational Research Association).
Lecturer on creativity to Albermarle County, Virginia, class on the Gifted and Talented (1976).
In-service programs on testing in Albermarle County, Virginia (1974-77).
Evaluator of Title IV-C Grant - Gifted and Talented Education for Charlottesville City Schools (1976 - present).
Test construction for educational programs at Western State Hospital (1975).
Consultant to critical thinking skills project, Arlington, Virginia (1975-1976).
Consultant to Virginia Council of Mathematic Supervisors on testing (1976).
Consultant to National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented (1975 - present).
Evaluator of Project Alpha (Seneca, SC) Gifted Program (1976-1977).
Consultant to Fluvanna County and Chesterfield County (Virginia programs for the gifted and talented (1977).
Evaluator of Project GREAT: An Inservice Training package for the State of Louisiana in Gifted and Talented (1976-1979).
Instructor: Workshop for Teachers of the Gifted (credit course taught at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Summer, 1977).
Service on Advisory Board of AAAS Grant, "Study of Coping Strategies of Successful Handicapped Scientists," (1977-1978).
Consultant to programs for gifted and talented in Anne Arundel, Howard, Prince George's and Harford Counties, Maryland (1976-1978).
Evaluation Consultant to Chapel Hill Gifted-Handicapped Project, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, (1977-1978).
Consultant to Inservice Training Project of State Department of Education, South Carolina (May, 1977, May, 1978, and May, 1979).
Review of State Department Proposals for the Office of Gifted and Talented (Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped) (July, 1977).
Consultant to Buckingham County Title IV-C Program on Gifted and Talented (August, 1977.)
On-site evaluation of South Boston, Virginia, program for the gifted (Title IV-C Grant) (May, 1977).
Evaluation Consultant to Royal Oak, Michigan Program for the Gifted and Talented (September, 1977-1978).

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (CONTINUED):

Development of a "Program Planning Survey"--an instrument to be used by gifted programs in Maryland by the Maryland State Department of Education (1977).
Group Leader and Facilitator (Gifted Educators) - Title IV-C Conference, Norfolk, Virginia (October, 1977).
Inservice to teachers of the Virginia Beach Gifted Program. Virginia Beach, Virginia (November, 1977).
Inservice for Midwestern Intermediate Unit IV on Evaluating programs for the gifted. Grove City, Pennsylvania (November, 1977).
Consultant to Intermediate Unit IV on the evaluation of programs for the gifted. Saginaw, Michigan (January, 1978).
Inservice to Greensboro City Public Schools Gifted and Talented Program. Greensboro, North Carolina (March, 1978).
Consultant to Harford County, Maryland, Public Schools on Identification of the Gifted and Talented (April and July, 1978).
Consultant to Department of Education (Virginia) on the development of test specifications for the Basic Learning Skills objectives in reading (April, August, October, and December 1978).
Consultant to Ypsalanti, Michigan, Public Schools Program for the Gifted and Talented. Ypsalanti, Michigan (April, 1978, October, 1978, February, 1979, and March, 1979).
Inservice for Greenville Public Schools Program for the Gifted and Talented, Greenville, South Carolina (May, 1978).
Consultant to Southern Westchester Board of Cooperative Services. (Evaluation consultant for the program for gifted and talented students) Ardsley, New York (July, 1978).
Consultant to Goochland County Public Schools on programs for the gifted. Inservice presentation to teachers and administrators and parents. Goochland County, Virginia (August, 1978, October, 1978, November, 1978, and April, 1979).
Inservice for Nassau County Board of Cooperative Services on the evaluation of the perfomance of gifted students. Westbury, NY (September, 1978).
Inservice for Fauquier County Gifted/Talented Committee, Fauquier County (Virginia) (July, 1979, August, 1979).
Inservice for Louisiana State Department of Education Regional Workshops on Gifted (1977, 1978, 1979.)
Consultant to Pittsylvania County Gifted Program (September, 1978).
Inservice for Nelson County, Virginia high school teachers on classroom testing. (September, 1978).
Review Editor for the series What Research Says to the Teacher of the Exceptional Child (Council for Exceptional Children) (1977 - present).
Member of Planning Committee of the Virginia Alliance for Arts Education -- Very Special Arts Festival (1978-79).
Evaluation Consultant to Richland School District #2, Columbia, South Carolina (1978-1979).
Consultant to Spotsylvania Public Schools Program for the Gifted, Spotsylvania, Virginia (November, 1978, May, 1979, August, 1979, September, 1979).

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (CONTINUED):

Evaluator of Project IDEA, a Title IV-C Grant to Halifax County Public Schools, Halifax , Virginia (1978 - present).
Consultant to Williamsburg Intermediate School Gifted Program, Arlington, Virginia (November, 1978).
Inservice for Nassau County Board of Cooperative Services on the evaluation of gifted programs. Westbury, New York (February, 1979).
Consultant to Wyoming State Department of Education on the evaluation of programs for the gifted. (February, 1979).
Review of proposals for the Office of Gifted and Talented, Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped. (March, 1979).
Presentation to parents of identified gifted children in Bedford County, Virginia. (March, 1979).
Presentation to CEED 711 class of School of Continuing Education University of Virginia, South Boston, Virginia (March, 1979) and Bedford, Virginia (July, 1979).
Presentation to parents of gifted students, Lynchburg Public Schools, Lynchburg, Virginia (April, 1979).
Presentations to teachers, administrators and parents of gifted children in Iowa on evaluation of gifted programs. Ankeny, Iowa (March, 1979).
Consultant on identification of the gifted to Prince George's County, Maryland Program for Gifted and Talented. Upper Marlboro, Maryland (March, 1979).
Inservice on curriculum for teachers of Rockford Public Schools Program for the Gifted , Rockford, Illinois (August, 1979).
Inservice on curriculum for the gifted for teachers of Quantico Dependents' School System, Quantico, Virginia (August, 1979).
Evaluation Consultant to gifted program of Northglen Public Schools, Northglen, Colorado (1978-1979).
Presentation on evaluation and inservice for gifted programs for Iowa teachers, parents and administrators. Davenport, Iowa (September, 1979).

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CONFERENCES:

03/20/72 - Council for Exceptional Children (Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.) "The Connecticut MARK I Creativity Program."

04/07/72 - American Educational Research Association (Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois) "Investigation of the Creative Productivity of Groups" (with S.V. Owen and J.S. Renzulli).

05/10/72 - International Reading Association (Annual Meeting, Detroit, Michigan) "Materials for Fostering Creativity at the Senior High Level" (with J.S. Renzulli).

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CONFERENCES (CONTINUED):

06/08/72 - Workshop for Teachers of the Gifted (Hartford, Connecticut) "The MARK I Creativity Program."

11/10/72 - The Association for the Gifted, Regional Convention (New Haven, Connecticut) "Open Education for the Disadvantaged."

01/24/74 - "Creativity in Learning." Presentation at the Annual Parent and Family Life Dinner, Hampton Council of PTA, Hampton, Virginia.

04/18/74 - "And Why Don't You Want to Be a Nurse: The Plight of the Gifted Girl." Chairman of the Symposium and presentation at the annual meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children, New York, 1974.

05/17/74 - "Creativity in Reading." Presentation to the Connecticut Reading Association, New Britain, Connecticut.

06/02/74 - "New Direction in Creativity Training Programs." Presentation at the National Conference on the Gifted. Albany, New York.

06/22/74 - Commencement Address, Taconic Hills High School, Philmont, New York.

02/12/76 - "A Consideration of Issues Relating to Statewide Testing Programs." Paper presented at the Virginia Council of Mathematics Supervisors, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

02/15/76 - "A Consideration of Issues in the Construction of Alternative Means of Identifying the Gifted and Talented." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children, Chicago, Illinois.

05/15/76 - "What To Do With Gifted Children: Strategies for Parents and Teachers" and "Evaluation of Gifted Programs." Papers presented at the Delaware State-Wide Conference on the Education of Gifted and Talented, Dover, Delaware.

10/14/76 - "Identification of the Gifted and Talented." Paper presented to the Virginia Association of School Psychologists, Blacksburg, Virginia.

11-12/76 - "Issues in Grading Procedures in the Mathematics Classroom." Paper presented to teachers in the Virginia Beach Public Schools.

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CONFERENCES (CONTINUED):

01/28/77 - "Evaluation of Programs for the Gifted-Handicapped." Paper presented at the Topical Conference on the Gifted-Handicapped, New Orleans, Louisiana.

03/05/77 - "Why Everyone Can't Teach the Gifted." Paper presented at the Potomac Regional Mathematic Conference, Fairfax, Virginia.

03/21/77 - "Evaluation of Programs for the Gifted and Talented." Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference and Exhibition on Measurement and Evaluation, Los Angeles, California.

04/08/77 - "Cognitive Complexity and Its Relationship to the Classroom Cognitive Behaviors of Teachers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York (with P. Williams).

05/14/77 - "Identification of the Gifted and Talented." Paper presented at Adelphi University Conference on the Gifted and Talented, Garden City, New York.

07/22/77 - "Evaluating Programs for the Gifted." Paper presented at Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

08/03/77 - "Evaluating Programs for the Gifted." Paper presented at Michigan State University/Michigan State Department of Education Conference on the Gifted and Talented, Lansing, Michigan.

11/11/77 - "Using Creativity Training Material." Paper presented to teachers of the Virginia Beach Public Schools Program for the Gifted and Talented, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

11/19/77 - "Gifted Program Evaluation." Presented at the Annual Southeastern Council for Gifted/Talented Education Instructional Workshop/Conference, Norfolk, Virginia.

12/03/77 - "Teacher Perceptions of the Usefulness of Particular Item Types to Assess Selective Cognitive Outcomes Suggested by the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives." Presented at the Sixteenth Southeastern Invitational Conference on Measurement in Education, Blacksburg, Virginia.

02/24/78 - "Reactions to 'A Model for Defining and Identifying Gifted'." Invitational Conference on Early Identification and Reading Instruction for Gifted Children, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CONFERENCES (CONTINUED):

03/04/78 - "Measuring the Progress and Achievement of the Gifted Child." Presented at the Third Annual Northern Virginia Conference on the Gifted and Talented, Manassas, Virginia.

05/16/78 - "The Gifted and Talented Woman." Presented at the National Forum on Minority/Disadvantaged Gifted and Talented (United States Office of Education, Office of Gifted and Talented), Washington, D.C.

07/05/78 - "Counseling and Evaluating the Gifted Child." Presentation at the Worcester State Teacher's College Institute on the Gifted, Worcester State Teacher's College, Worcester, Massachusetts.

07/17/78 - "Evaluation of Programs for the Gifted and Talented." Presented at the Workshop of Gifted and Talented of the Michigan State Department of Michigan, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

07/25/78 - "Identifying the Gifted and Talented." Presentation at the Superintendent's Summer Conference for Administrators and Supervisors, Montgomery County, Maryland.

02/22/79 - "How to Differentiate for the Gifted." Presentation at Wyoming State Department of Education Conference on the Gifted. Cheyenne, Wyoming.

03/24/79 - "Implementing the Enrichment Triad Model." Presentation at the Fourth Annual Northern Virginia Conference on the Gifted and Talented, Arlington, Virginia.

03/29/79 - "The Administrator's Role in Education of the Gifted." Conference for Michigan School Administrators, Lansing, Michigan.

03/31/79 - "The Enrichment Triad Model." Presentation at a graduate institute of Emmanuel College, Boston, Massachusetts.

04/11/79 - Discussant on panel entitled "Women and Power". Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, California.

05/15/79 - "Current Research in Gifted Education". Presentation at the workshop entitled "Gifted and Talented Education in Perspective." Wake County (Raleigh) North Carolina.

PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CONFERENCES (CONTINUED):

06/22/79 - Workshop on Evaluation. Presentation to NASBE sponsored seminar for state consultants for the gifted and talented. Washington, D.C.

07/05/79 - "Curriculum for the Gifted." Presentation at The Graduate Institute on Gifted Children at Adelphi University, Garden City, New York.

07/19/79 -"The Enrichment Triad Model". Presentation at Bedford County Continuing Education Class, Bedford County, Virginia.

07/25/79 - "Evaluating Students and Programs." Presentation at the Athena III Institute, Converse College, University of South Carolina at Spartanburg, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

08/06/79 - "The Gifted and Talented Girl." Presentation at the Second Annual Confratute, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.

10/12/79 - "Writing for Journals". Presentation for graduate and faculty seminar at Howard University, Washington, D.C.

10/28/79 - "A Course for Gifted Girls in the Secondary School". Presentation at the Second Annual Conference of Southeastern Virginia Council for the Education of the Gifted. Yorktown, Virginia.

PUBLICATIONS:

Teacher identification of superior students. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 211-214 (with J. S. Renzulli and R.K. Hartman).

Key features: A practical model for program evaluation. Curriculum Trends, February, 1972, 1-8 (with J.S. Renzulli and F.X. Archambault).

Investigation of the creative productivity of groups. 1972 AERA Abstracts. Washington, D.C.: AERA, 36, 1972, 36 with S.V. Owen and J.S. Renzulli).

New Directions in Creativity (Vol. 3). New York: Harper and Row, 1972, 150 pp. (with J.S. Renzulli).

Fluency, flexibility, and originality as a function of group size. Journal of Creative Behavior, 1974, 8, 2, 107-113 (with J.S. Renzulli and S.V. Owen).

PUBLICATIONS (CONTINTUED):

Development and evaluation of a creativity training program. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, 1, 44-45.

Creativity training activities for secondary school students. Chapter in the book, A Design for Excellence: Reading for Gifted Learners, Michael Lubuda (ed.), IRA, 1974 (with J.S. Renzulli).

Evaluating and using creativity development materials. Learning, 1974, 2, 9, 1974 (with J.S. Renzulli).

Developing creativity training materials. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1975, XIX, 38-45.

Review of Women and Educational Testing. Journal of Law and Education, 1975, 4, 556-559.

Scales for rating the behavioral characteristics of gifted children: A compendium. Wethersfield, CT: Creative Learning Press, 1977 (with J.S. Renzulli, et al.).

Gifted and talented women. Chapter to be printed in the National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook on the Gifted and Talented. A. Harry Passow, Editor.

What research says to the teacher of the exceptional child: Creativity and the Gifted. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

An evaluation of New Directions in Creativity. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1977, 21, 538-545.

"Fact Sheet on evaluating programs for the gifted." Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Teacher Perceptions of the usefulness of particular item types to assess selected cognitive categories. Journal of Social Studies Research, 1978, 2, 36-41.

Superior abilities. In J.M. Kauffman and D.P. Hallahan, Handbook of Special Education. Prentice-Hall (in press).

Enrichment for the gifted student. In D. Treffinger, Education of the Gifted and Talented. New York; Academic Press. (in press).

The gifted girl: An anomaly? Roeper Review, (in press). To be reprinted in Psychology and Education of the Gifted. W.B. Barbe and J.S. Renzulli (Eds.) Irvington (in press).

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES:

American Educational Research Association
Council for Exceptional Children
CEC Publication Committee (1978 - present)
The Association for the Gifted
  TAG Nominating Committee: 1973, 1978
  Membership Chairman: 1974-1977
  Executive Committee: 1975 - present
  Governor-at-Large: 1978-1981
  Research Committee: 1977-1978
Editor: Journal of Education of the Gifted (1977 - present)
American Psychological Association
  Member of Division 15 Committee on the Teaching of Educational Psychology: 1973-1975
National Council on Measurement and Evaluation
National Association for Gifted Children
Virginia Association for the Gifted
  Membership Chairman: 1974 - present
  Coordinator of the Day of the Gifted: March 7, 1975
  Steering Committee for the Formation of the Virginia Association for the Education of the Gifted
  Virginia Educational Research Association
  Chairman: Committee to Select

HONORS:

Virginia Educational Research Association Award for Distinguished Research (Two papers, Spring, 1977)
Phi Beta Kappa
Phi Kappa Phi
Kappa Delta Pi
Pi Lambda Theta
Pi Mu Epsilon (Mathematics Honorary)
Phi Delta Kappa

FACULTY SERVICE (ELECTED RESPONSIBILITIES):

Faculty Council of the School of Education (1974-1976)
  Secretary (1974-1976)

Faculty Affairs Committee of the School of Education (1978-1979)

University Senate (1976-1979)
  Executive Committee of the Senate (1977-1979)

Secretary of the Faculty of the School of Education (1978-1979)

FACULTY SERVICE (COMMITTEES):

Quantitative Research Exam (1975 - present)

Faculty Search Committee

Planning Committee for Retreat on Measurement (1978-1979)

GRANTS:

Subcontract with Saginaw Township Public Schools, Saginaw, Michigan, to develop a model evaluation design and assessment instruments for gifted programs in that district.

February 9, 1978

VITA

ROBERT W. COVERT

I Personal Data

Date of Birth:	January 5, 1943
Place of Birth:	Davenport, Iowa
Marital Status:	Married
Present Position:	Associate Professor Evaluation Research Center University of Virginia 164 Rugby Road Charlottesville, Virginia 22903 804-924-7163

II Education

B.S. Grove City College, Pennsylvania, 1965 (Mathematics)
M.Ed. Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1967, (Secondary Education)
Ph.D. Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1972 (Educational Psychology: Research & Measurement)

III Experience

A. (Teaching)

Jr. High School

1965 John Paul Jones Jr. High, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1967-1969 Girard College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

College

1977-present Associate Professor, Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

1972-1977 Assistant Professor Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

1974 (Summer) Assistant Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology and Counseling, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

1972 (Spring) Associate Professor, Dept. of Education, Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania

1969-1972 Teaching Associate, Dept. of Educational Psychology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

B. Evaluation Projects Directed

1973 Project Co-Director Evaluation of National Trainers of Teachers Trainers Project

1973-1975	Project Co-Director	National Teacher Teacher Pilot Program
1972-1975	Project Director	Evaluator, Rhode Island Teacher Center, Rhode Island State Dept. of Evaluation
1974	Project Director	Evaluation of Visually Impaired Learning Disabilities Competency Based Master Program, Charlottesville, Va.
1975	Project Co-Director	Evaluator of the Center for Educational Advancement
1975	Project Director	Rhode Island Right to Read Program
1976	Project Director	Evaluation of Community Mental Health After-care Program, Charlottesville, Virginia
1977	Project Director	Admissions of Community Mental Health Clients, Charlottesville, Virginia
1976-present	Project Director	Evaluation of Crime Resistance Program, Charlottesville/Albermarle County, Virginia
1976-present	Project Director	Evaluation of Parent Infant Program for the Hearing Impaired, Logan, Utah
1979-present		Evaluator for proposal of Blind/Deaf/Autistic project with Tom Clark to BEH for First Chance Projects

C. Training

Experience includes development of materials and training in the area of program evaluation at both local and national level. Participated on an average of 5 evaluation training workshops per year over the past four years.

D. Consultation

Experienced in working with State Departments, Federal Government School Districts and Universities at local, state and national levels.

E. Periodical Articles

Covert, R. W., Chansky, N. W., Westler, L. "The Factor Structure of the Runner Studies of Attitude Patterns." Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 32 (4), Winter, 1972.

Covert, R. W., Bean, A. "Prediction of College Persistence Withdrawals and Academic Dismissal: A Discriminant Analysis." Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 33(2), Summer 1973.

Covert, R.W., Nugett, J., Chansky, N.M., "The Item Factor Structure of the Runner Studies of Attitude Patterns." Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 33(2). Summer, 1973

Soucar, E., Wolk, S., Covert, R.W. "Effects of rewarded interpolated tasks upon short-term retention." Psychonomic Science, 1971, Vol. 22(6).

Sower, R., Covert, R.W., "Identifying pre-schoolers with special needs: a county-wide project to help plan future special services in the public schools." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded. Keystone Learning Center, Vol. 10,(2), April 1975. (To be reprinted in Education & Training of Mentally Retarded, 1975, Vol. 10, 84-90.

Covert, R.W., "A Fortran IV Program to compute the acoustical confusability rating of syllables." Behavioral Science.

Covert, R.W., Chansky, N.M., "A note on the moderator effect of undergraduate grade point average on the prediction of success in graduate education." Educational and Psychological Measurement. (In press)

Covert, R.W., Mason, E.J., Factorial validity of a student evaluation of teaching instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1974, Vol. 34.

Mason, E.J., Covert, R.W., Hayes, M., "Validity and reliability of a simple device for readiness screening." Educational and Psychological Measurement. (Fall 1975)

Buttram, J., Covert, R.W., Hayes, M., "Prediction of school readiness and early grade school achievement with the Hayes Early Identification Listening Response Test (HEILRT)." Educational and Psychological Measurement. 1976,36.

Buttram, J., Covert, R.W., Wilson, M., Simpson, L., Harwood, R., "Discrepancy Evaluation Model Applied to a University Career Counseling Program." Journal of College Placement (Summer 1977)

Covert, R.W., "Evaluation Training as Distinct from Research Training." The CEDR Quarterly (accepted for publication).

Abstractor for Educational and Psychological Measurement from 1970 to present.

Abstractor for Pupil Personnel Services Journal, Minnesota Department of Education.

Abstractor for Teacher Education, Indian Association of Teacher Educators.

Professional Affiliations

American Educational Research Association

National Council of Measurement in Education

Evaluation Network

Evaluation Research Society

VITA

Martin S. Aylesworth
Department of Foundations
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

PERSONAL DATA

Date of Birth: Spetember 19, 1947

Marital Status: Married, four children

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia. B.A. Philosophy, 1975

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia. M.Ed. Educational Psychology: Education of the Gifted and Educational Measurement, 1979

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Evaluator, Project TIME, Buckingham County, Virginia, 1979-80.

Evaluator, Manassas Park Gifted/Talented Program, Manassas Park, Virginia, 1979-80.

Cluster Leader for Evaluation Training Consortium, Type I Workshop, Washington, D.C., September, 1979.

Member of evaluation team, Saginaw, Michigan Enrichment Center Program, Saginaw, Michingan, 1979-present.

Co-Instructor for EDFD 711: Gifted Children, Halifax, Virginia, 1980.

Lecturer on program evaluation, EDU 580: Gifted Children, Longwood College, Farmville, Virginia, 1980.

Intern teacher, Univer ty of Virginia Summer Enrichment Program, 1980.

PRESENTATIONS

06/22/79 Workshop on Evaluation, Washington, D.C. Presentation to NASBE sponsored seminar for state consultants for the gifted and talented.

08/06/79 Virginia Testing Conference, Staunton, Virginia. "Validating Identification Procedures in Gifted and Talented Programs: Some Problems and Possible Solutions." (with P. Vanco).

03/08/80 Northern Virginia Council for Gifted/Talented Education. Annual Conference, Alexandria, Virginia. "Evaluation - If there's to Be a Future" (with P. Vanco)

04/08/80 American Educational Research Association. Annual meeting, Boston, Massachusetts. "Evaluating a Local Gifted Program, an LEA/University Cooperative Effort" (with C.M. Callahan, R. Covert, M. Crovo, and P. Vanco).

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Educational Research Association

VITA

Marguerite M. Vanco
Department of Research and Evaluation
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

June, 1980

PERSONAL DATA

Date of Birth: March 24, 1946

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degrees and Certification

Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania. B.A. Studio Art, 1968

Edinboro College, Edinboro, Pennsylvania. Teaching Certification Elementary Education, 1974

University of Virginia, Charlottesville. M.Ed. Educational Evaluation, 1980

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Learning Resource Aide, Burton School, Erie, Pennsylvania, 1972-74.

Teacher, Grade 2 Amelia County Elementary School, Amelia, Virginia, 1975-76.

Teacher, Title I Math, Amelia County Elementary School, Amelia, Virginia, 1976-78.

Teacher, Southside Institute for Gifted and Talented, Farmville, Virginia, 1978.

Evaluator, Project TEAMS, American Association of School Administrators, and National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1978-79.

Consultant to Albemarle County Schools on data analysis of Parent Questionnaire, Albermarle County, Virginia, 1979.

Cluster Leader for Evaluation Training Consortium Type I Workshop, Washington, D.C., September, 1979.

Member of evaluation team to develop model evaluation design and assessment instruments for gifted programs in Saginaw Township, Michigan, 1979 to present.

Cluster leader for Evaluation Training Consortium Type II Workshop, Orlando, Florida, May, 1980.

Co-Instructor for EDFD 711 class: Gifted Children, Halifax, Virginia, 1980.

Lecturer on identification and student assessment in programs for gifted to EDU 580, Gifted Children, Longwood College, Farmville, Virginia, 1980.

Master Teacher for University of Virginia Summer Enrichment Program, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1980.

PRESENTATIONS AT STATE AND LOCAL CONFERENCES

06/22/79 Workshop on Evaluation. Presentation to NASBE sponsored seminar for state consultants for the gifted and talented. Washington, D.C.

08/06/79 Virginia Testing Conference (Staunton, Virginia). "Validating Identification Procedures in Gifted and Talented Programs: Some Problems and Possible Solutions." (with M. Aylesworth)

03/08/80 Northern Virginia Council for Gifted/Talented Education (Annual Conference Alexandria, Virginia) "Student Assessment in Fine Arts Components of Gifted Programs."

03/08/80 Northern Virginia Council for Gifted/Talented Education (Annual Conference, Alexandria, Virginia) "Evaluation - If there's to Be a Future" (with M. Aylesworth)

04/08/80 American Educational Research Association (Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts) "Evaluating a Local Gifted Program: An LEA/University Cooperative Effort" (with C.M. Callahan, R. Covert, M. Aylesworth, and M. Crovo)

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Educational Research Association

AWARDS

06/17/80 Paul B. Walter Master of Education Outstanding Student Award

PROCESS OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

Product Objective(s) to which Process Objective is Related	1.0 and 2.0

PROCESS OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1. Individual(s)

Project Director
Teacher
Evaluation team

2 Behavior

Develop and implement

3 Object of Behavior

Curriculum for academically talented students.

4 Time

August 1981

5 Measurement

Consultant review form.
Teacher review .
Unit feedback forms from students and teachers

6 Criterion for Success

Publishable curriculum guide

DESCRIP. OF SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

7.

Units of curriculum that will be developed by the project director, teacher and curriculum writer or the evaluation team. Each unit will be evaluated by teachers, outside experts and field tested or local students. Results of field tests and experts review will be used in modifying the curriculum. After the curriculum has been completed it will be tested with other groups of talented children to determine its effectiveness

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule

Ongoing Sept. 1979 - Aug. 1981

9. Data Analysis

Evaluation team will review data from teachers, consultants and student feedback forms and report it to curriculum writer, teachers, and project director for purpose of curriculum revie

10. If a comparison group is used, plea identify participants.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

Product Objective(s) to which Process Objective is Related	3.0 and 4.0

PROCESS OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1. Individual(s)

Project director, Teachers, local artisans, evaluation team.

2 Behavior

Develop and implement

3 Object of Behavior

Curriculum for talented students in Fine Arts

4 Time

August 1982

5 Measurement

Consultants review forms
Teacher review forms
Unit feedback forms from students and artists

6 Criterion for Success

Publishable curriculum guide

DESCRIP. OF SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

7.

Units of curriculum that will be developed by the project director, teacher and curriculum writer or the evaluation team. Each unit will be evaluated by teachers, outside experts and field tested or local students. Results of field tests and experts review will be used in modifying the curriculum. After the curriculum has been completed it will be tested with other groups of talented children to determine its effectiveness

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule

Ongoing Sept. 1979 - Aug. 1982

9. Data Analysis

Evaluation team will revie data from teachers, consultants and student feedback forms and report it to curriculum writer, teachers, and project director for purpose of curriculum review.

10. If a comparison group is used, please identify participants.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

Product Objective(s) to which Process Objective is Related	5.0

PROCESS OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1. Individual(s)

Project director, local artists, teachers, evaluation team

2 Behavior

will develop and implement

3 Object of Behavior

teacher/administrator inservice

4 Time

May 1980

5 Measurement

project log

6 Criterion for Success

DESCRIP. OF SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

7.

The project director, teacher, local artist in cooperation with the evaluation team will develop a teacher/administrator inservice to make them

1. Knowledgeable about gifted/talent programs
2. Willing to encourage appropriate students to participate

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule

Following each inservice during 79-80.

9. Data Analysis

Evaluation team will summarize data from each inservice and provide feedback to project director for changing or modifying inservice training.

10. If a comparison group is used, pleas identify participants.

PROCESS OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

Product Objective(s) to which Process Objective is Related	6.0

PROCESS OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1. Individual(s)

Project director
Evaluation team

2 Behavior

Will develop and implement

3 Object of Behavior

Parent program

4 Time

May 1980

5 Measurement

Locally developed parent questionnaire
Log of parent participation

6 Criterion for Success

A parent program which can be exported

DESCRIP. OF SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

7.

The project director will schedule four parent meetings throughout the school year. She will plan a program for each. A brief questionnaire will be passed out at the end of each session.

Parents participation in regular program activities will be recorded in a log.

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule

Regularly administered parent questionnaire Sept. 79 Aug. 80 and log of parents activities.

9. Data Analysis

Results of the questionnaire will be summarized by the evaluation team and fed back immediately to the project staff for purpose of modification and improvement of parent program.

10. If a comparison group is used, please identify participants.

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

Project Goal

1. To develop and validate a measurement instrument that may be used to assess individual student progress on the acquisition of skills in critical thinking.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1 Individual(s)

Evaluation team (Consultant for measurement/research, consultant for gifted educ. curriculum writer, specialists (2) in evaluation/ research and gifted educ.

2 Behavior

write and validate

3 Object of Behavior

test or measurement tool related to critical thinking skills

4 Time

May, 1980

5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement)

existence of written measurement instrument

6 Criterion for Success

validated as being able to assess growth on critical thinking skills among students in gifted programs

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

7.

By the end of August, 1979 the Evaluation Team will have developed a draft instrument to measure child progress on critical thinking skills.

During the first year of the project the Team will pilot the draft instrument, assess the content validity of the questions, and administer the instrument to a control group.

As a result of these procedures, the instrument will be revised in time to allow its use as a post-test at the end of the school year in May, 1980.

Plans will also be ready, by May, 1980, for the collection of norming data during the next school year (the second year of this project.)

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.)

Validated instrument must be available by May, 1980.

9. Data Analysis

1. Pilot test of items.
   - A. Calculate item analysis.
   - B. Assess internal consistency.
   - C. Assess equivalent forms reliability.
   - D. Refine instrument and administer as post-test.
   - E. Collect IQ data for use in construct validation.
2. Assess content validity of instrument.
3. Control group validation on refined instrument.
   - A. Identify matched populations.
   - B. Administer refined instrument as post-test.
   - C. Gather data on IQ, achievement.
   - D. Assess equivalent forms reliability.
   - E. Assess convergent/ discriminant validity.

10. Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use.

Two matching populations of gifted students (one population in a gifted program, the second not in a program) will be compared with the experimental group.

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

2. To develop and validate a measurement instrument that will assess the self-perceptions of students enrolled in a program for the gifted and talented.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES	EVALUATION DESIGN
1 Individual(s) Evaluation Team	7. By the end of August, 1979 the Evaluation Team will have developed a draft instrument to measure student self-perceptions. During the first year of the project the Team will pilot this draft instrument, assess the content validity of the questions, and administer the instrument to a control group. As a result of these procedures, the instrument will be revised in time to allow its use as a post-test at the end of the school year in May, 1980. Plans will also be ready, by May, 1980, for the collection of norming data during the next school year (the second year of this project).	8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.) Validated, revised instrument will be available by May, 1980.
2 Behavior write and validate		9. Data Analysis 1. Pilot of test items. A. Calculate item analysis data. B. Assess internal consistency. C. Refine instrument and administer as post-test. D. Collect IQ data for use in construct validation. 2. Assess content validity of instrument. 3. Control group validation on refined instrument. A. Identify matched populations. B. Administer refined instrument as post-test. C. Gather data on I.Q., achievement. D. Assess convergent/ discriminant validity.
3 Object of Behavior test or measurement tool related to self-perception		
4 Time May, 1980		
5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement) existence of written measurement instrument or measurement procedures		
6 Criterion for Success validated as being able to assess changes in self-perception on the part of students enrolled in programs for gifted/talented.		10 Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use. Two matching populations of gifted students (one population in a gifted program, the other not in a program) will be compared with the experimental group.

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

Project Goal

3. To develop evaluation measures for the formal curriculum content units to be taught during the school year 1979-80 in the programs for the academically talented and the fine and performing arts.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____	DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES	EVALUATION DESIGN
1 Individual(s) Project Director, Enrichment Center instructors, Evaluation Team	7. The Evaluation team will, together with the Project Director, develop a format for curriculum planning that will include evaluation as an integral part of the planning. Curriculum units for the 1979-80 school year, in the program for fine and performing arts as well as that for the academically talented, will be planned and developed, using this format. Evaluation activities related to the curriculum units will be developed by the Evaluation Team. The evaluation activities will measure not only the acquisition of content but the degree to which the student is able to deal with and interpret this content using higher order thinking skills (e.g. analysis, synthesis).	8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.) Tests or evaluation techniques must be ready by the end of each curriculum unit.
2 Behavior write and produce		9. Data Analysis Content validation by instructor staff. Other analysis for item difficulty, reliability, etc., by Evaluation Team.
3 Object of Behavior tests and evaluation procedures		
4 Time May, 1980		
5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement) Existence of tests or evaluation procedures for the major curriculum units taught in the 1979-80 school year		
6 Criterion for Success Tests matched to curriculum. Tests capable of measuring acquisition of content at higher thinking levels.		10. Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use. Comparison groups may not be used unless some are able to be found which share an exposure to the same content as in the Enrichment Center.

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

4. To develop a system for reporting individual student progress data to the parents of and the students enrolled in the programs for the academically talented and the fine and performing arts.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER ____

1 Individual(s)

Project Director, Enrichment Center staff, Evaluation Team, members of Parent Support Group

2 Behavior

develop forms and "report card" system

3 Object of Behavior

reporting of individual student progress

4 Time

May, 1980

5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement)

Existence of forms and recording system

6 Criterion for Success Subjectively judged by 80% of Parent Support Group as informative and adequate to provide them information on the progress of their children. Judged by 100% of staff as valid for reporting progress.

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

7.

Project staff, with the assistance of the Evaluation Team, will develop a system by which parents and students will receive reports outlining student progress in either the program for the academically talented or that for the fine and performing arts.

"Report cards" will be developed along with a system to record progress in the permanent records of students.

A process will also be developed to report student progress to the regular home-base teacher of each student enrolled in the programs.

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.)

System must be in place by May, 1980.

9. Data Analysis

Teachers and parents will be surveyed as to their level of satisfaction with the amount of information provided by the system, its clarity and usefulness to them.

10. Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use.

None

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

5. To develop the formats for both a Curriculum Guide and a Manual for the Evaluation of Gifted/Talented Programs.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1 Individual(s)

Evaluation Team, Project Director

2 Behavior

write and outline

3 Object of Behavior

format or blueprint for Curriculum Guide and Evaluation Manual

4 Time

May, 1980

5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement)

Existence of outline for both manuals

6 Criterion for Success

Format judged to be potentially useful by gifted/talented educators in other programs.

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

7.

An outline will be made of a Curriculum Guide that would be disseminated to others wishing information about how to conduct a program for gifted and talented students. Administrators of other programs will be asked for suggestions as to what this format should cover so as to increase its usefulness.

A similar outline will be developed for an Evaluation Manual that, when disseminated, would assist administrators of other gifted/talented programs in planning evaluation procedures for those programs.

These two documents will be complete only at the end of this three-year project but the format for them will be developed in the first year so that material may be conveniently inserted into the format as the project progresses and it becomes clear which curriculum units were effective in producing change and which evaluation procedures were effective in assessing that change.

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.)

Formats must be ready by May, 1980.

9. Data Analysis

Subjective analysis by gifted/talented consultants and staff of other projects for gifted education.

10. Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use.

None

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

6. To develop procedures for the identification and selection of students gifted or potentially talented in the fine or performing arts.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1 Individual(s)

Project Director, Advisory Council, project staff, Subcommittee on Student Selection, project consultants

2 Behavior

develop and write procedures

3 Object of Behavior

identification, selection of students gifted or potentially talented in fine or performing arts

4 Time

November, 1979

5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement)

Existence of procedures

6 Criterion for Success

Ability to actually identify those students who appear to have talent. 75% match with those nominated by teachers.

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

7.

Procedures will be developed to identify students. These procedures will involve some kind of general exposure to all students in grades 5-8.

Following exposure, nominations will be opened from staff, parents, peers, and self.

Some kind of performance or audition will cap the identification procedures.

A Selection Committee will consider all data, and make recommendations on enrollment to the Project Director.

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.)

Identification and selection procedures need to be ready for implementation by November, 1979.

9. Data Analysis

Feedback from instructors in the program as to the quality of students enrolled. Judgment as to the extent to which the selection procedures adequately placed in the program students with possessed or potential talent in fine or performing arts.

10 Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use.

None

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

7. To link the school with the arts community by involving in the fine and performing arts instructional program practicing artists from the Saginaw area community.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER ____	DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES	EVALUATION DESIGN
1 Individual(s) Artists and performers (Visual Arts and Drama)	7. The curriculum developed for the fine and performing arts will be designed to be delivered by actual artists and dramatists. Student exposure to practicing arts (who "do" art as opposed to "teach about" art) is a vital ingredient of this program. When the curriculum for fine and performing arts has been outlined by the Project Director, the Evaluation Team, and the curriculum planning consultants, a search will begin for practicing artists to come into the program to demonstrate their art to students and involve them, in a hands-on way, in the production of their own art work.	8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.) May, 1980
2 Behavior demonstrate and involve students in		9. Data Analysis Subjective judgment of Project Director that sufficent number of artists has been involved and that artists have been successful in relating to and motivating students.
3 Object of Behavior production of art objects (Visual Arts) or performance of dramatic arts (Drama)		
4 Time May, 1980		
5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement) Existence of curriculum in Visual Arts and Drama		
6 Criterion for Success Involvement of practicing artists in instructional programs.		10 Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use. None

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

8. Develop, implement and refine parent program for the purpose of making parent awareness of program and individual childs progress in program.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related	

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER _____

1 Individual(s)

Parents of gifted/talented children (grades 5-8)

2 Behavior

a. will understand the functioning and

b. will participate in

3 Object of Behavior

a. knowledge of the total scope of the gifted program.
b. knowledge of individual childs progress.
c. various activities relating to the program.

4 Time

May 1980

5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement)

locally developed parent questionnaire

6 Criterion for Success

parents who are knowledgeable about program and child's progress and who participates in program activities.

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

7.

The project director will develop a series of three parent programs which will be conducted at regular intervals throughout the year in the evenings.

EVALUATION DESIGN

8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.)

questionnaire administered after each parent program

9. Data Analysis

results of the questionnaires will be summarized by the evaluation team and used to determine effectiveness of parent program

10. Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

9. To develop and implement an inservice program for teachers and administrators which will make them knowledgeable about the gifted/talented program and insure their cooperation.

Common Goal(s) of Michigan to Which Project Goal is Related

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES	EVALUATION DESIGN
1 Individual(s) Local teachers (grades 5-8)	7. The project director and teachers will develop an inservice training for gifted and talented programs. This training will be provided to all teachers and administrators in the district who deal with gifted/talented children at the 5-8 grade levels. Effectiveness of training will be determined by questionnaire results.	8. Data Collection Schedule (additional measures not listed in Box 5 should be shown here.) questionnaire administered after individual inservice training sessions.
2 Behavior a. will understand the functioning of b. will encourage participation in		9. Data Analysis The evaluation team will summarize the data from the questionnaire and report it to the staff for purpose of revision and modification of inservice training
3 Object of Behavior gifted/talented program		
4 Time May, 1980		
5 Measurement (list ONLY ONE measurement) locally developed questionnaire (including both cognitive and attitude items)		
6 Criterion for Success All teachers participate in inservice training and show positive attitudes about program.		10. Identify participants in the comparison group(s) you will use

SECOND TUESDAY

It was a relatively light agenda that faced the Saginaw Board of Education at its Sept. 16 Action Meeting. The Board heard both kind and unkind words from a handful of citizens, approved six administrative appointments, and voted to place a library millage renewal on the November ballot.

Here's a look at what happened at both the Sept. 9 Briefing Session and the Sept. 16 Action Meeting.

Six Building - Level Appointments OKed By Board

The Board approved six administrative appointments for the 1980-81 school year. Five of the six were made to fill assistant principals at the secondary level.

The six individuals, who were recommended by the superintendent after an extensive selection process, are:

- JOHN M. KRING, assistant principal for pupil personnel, Arthur Eddy Junior High.
- CARL G. MAPLE, special education program supervisor, Millet Learning Center
- DR. MILDRED MASON, assistant principal for curriculum, Arthur Eddy Junior High
- BURRIS R. SMITH, assistant principal for instruction, Arthur Hill High School
- ALFRED VINSON, assistant principal for pupil personnel, Averill Career Opportunities Center
- JULIE A. WALKER, assistant principal for curriculum, Averill Career Opportunities Center

See Board Report p. 29-30

The Way It Was: Board Receives 1979-80 Annual Report

The 1979-80 Annual Report of the Superintendent, hot off the presses, was distributed to Board members and the media Tuesday night. The 30 page publication, which will be mailed to all parents in the district, examines the progress made by the Saginaw Schools in each of the six major goal areas set by the Board prior to the start of the last school year. It also describes a variety of other programs and services that were offered during 1979-80, along with a look toward the future.

"This publication," said Supt. Gibbs, "will provide the citizens of Saginaw with a comprehensive overview of the past twelve months. It is our hope that through publications such as this we can help to build greater community understanding and awareness of the programs and services offered by our schools."

Citizens Offer Bouquets to Board, Administrators

It's not often that citizens come before the Board of Education to sing the praises of school administrators or Board members. Usually the public input session of the meeting is a place for individuals to air grievances.

And yet Tuesday night it happened not once but twice . . . and by people who have in the past brought their own grievances before the Board.

Darlene Carpenter, a parent in the Eddy district, thanked the Board and the administration for allowing her and other parents to take part in the principal selection process. "I would like to thank Dr. (Jerry) Baker and his staff for being so nice to us," she said. "When we started, I thought we might be treated like parents. But we were treated like staff. I appreciate that." She also thanked Board Secretary Willie Thompson for proposing the idea of parent participation. She said the parents were delighted with the selection of Ostranda Lane as Eddy principal and said they planned to work with him "in any way we can" to improve the educational program at the school.

Robert Thayler, whose son attends Webber Elementary, had kind words for Supt. Gibbs and urged community support for the upcoming 2 Mill Building Repair and Renovation Levy on Oct. 1. Mr. Thayler, who has been critical of the schools in the past, thanked the administration for acting quickly on several suggestions he made at the Sept. Briefing Session. He also thanked Dr. Gibbs for "being responsive to the needs of parents and their concerns. Not every district is fortunate to have a person like him." At the same time, Mr. Thayler pointed out the urgency of the upcoming millage proposals, especially the two new mills for building repair and renovation projects. He said this money could enable the district to replace portable classrooms.

Library Millage Proposal Scheduled for Nov. 4 Ballot

The Board passed a resolution placing a 1.5 mill renewal for the Saginaw Public Libraries on its Nov. 4 ballot. The proposal will, if passed, provide renewed operating funds for the libraries from 1981-85.

Supt. Gibbs Praises Smooth School Opening, Thanks Staff

Having completed what he called "the smoothest school opening in several years," Supt. Gibbs praised staff, parents and students for their contributions.

Speaking at the Briefing Session, Supt. Gibbs said: "This is the kind of school opening that everyone enjoys -- from superintendent to parents and students -- and helps to set a positive tone for the entire year. In education, the first week of school is crucial in setting the tone for student achievement and establishing the kind of cooperative effort necessary for learning to take place.

"The credit for this smooth opening of school belongs to all those who were involved in planning our various opening sessions and workshops and to the building staffs for their work in getting their schools and classrooms ready for the children. I would also like to commend the parents and students for their cooperation. From what I have observed and from the reports I have received, enthusiasm and cooperation appear to be evident on all fronts as we begin as a team to meet the challenges of the 1980's."